

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review

APRIL, 1942

THE BIBLE AND PREACHING

NOT long ago a writer in an American magazine wrote a story about a preacher. When one of his hearers returned home from a service, his wife asked him: 'What did he preach about?' The reply was: 'I don't know; he didn't tell us!' There have been other such sermons. Yet in all the churches it is the custom for a preacher to begin by quoting a few words from the Bible, and this text is supposed to serve as subject. Exceptions to this rule are so rare as to be singular. It is taken for granted that there ought to be an organic connection between the text and the sermon. Here is one of the postulates of Christian worship. 'Examine your postulates' is a good rule. Let us examine this one a little.

First, then, the Bible is preaching. The Jewish Church and the Christian both took centuries to select a canon. In the process both Churches asked one question about book after book—Does it preach? At the Reformation, when the Reformed Churches omitted the Apocrypha and thereby abandoned the Greek Canon of the Old Testament for the Hebrew Canon, it would have been well if they had reverted also to the Hebrew *arrangement* of the books. In the Greek order, which persists in our Bible, the books are arranged under *subjects*, and the subjects are 'history' (Genesis to Esther), poetry and kindred literature (Job to the Song of Songs), and Prophecy (Isaiah to Malachi). This arrangement is false to the Hebrew genius. For the Jew the Old Testament had and has only one subject: 'Thus saith the Lord'. It was arranged in three parts: 'Torah', a word that does not mean 'law' in the modern sense, but the teaching of the true way to live; 'Prophets', which included the Books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings, as well as the Written Prophets—every one of the 'historical' books being valued because it preached; and 'Writings', a miscellaneous collection of books, headed by the Psalms, whose preaching is indeed indirect, but often thereby the more effective. The right of a few books to a place in the Canon was disputed for generations just because they did not seem to *preach*. As for the New Testament, apart from the Book of the Acts of the Apostles, every book is obvious preaching, and the modern scholar tells us that when Luke wrote the Acts his main purpose in the selection and presentation of his material was not to write history but to preach. The Bible is preaching. There are no essays under Bible labels here!

But the Bible is not only preaching—it is *authoritative* preaching. This, of course, is just the meaning of the word 'canon'. One may illustrate by the way in which the Thirty-nine Articles deal with the Apocrypha. These, says the Sixth Article, '(as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet doth it not apply them to establish any

doctrine'. In other words, they may illustrate Christian truth, but are not authoritative for it. The question, 'Is the Old Testament authoritative for Christians?' has once and again been raised in set terms, but there is no doubt that for Christ and the Apostles the Old Testament was canonical, for it is remarkable how every part of the New Testament appeals, in one way or another, to the Hebrew Scriptures. Again, whenever the problem has been raised in the Church it has always rallied to the Old Testament. Yet from the first there has been a difference between Jews and Christians about the *nature* of the authority of the Old Testament. For the Jew the 'Law' was and is the *final* revelation; for the Christian it has always been *preparatory* to the final revelation. To quote New Testament phrases, our Lord 'came, not to destroy the law and the prophets', but to 'complete them'; the 'law' is a 'pedagogue to lead us' to Christ. This implies that for Christians, as for Jews, there is a kind of Canon within the Canon, something within the authoritative book that is a criterion for the rest. For the Jew this is the 'Law', the other parts of the Canon being interpreted by their harmony with this one. For Christians, on the other hand, the final authority for the whole of the Bible is our Lord Jesus Christ. Conformity with what He was, what He said, what He did—and for Him these three are one—is the final Christian criterion within the Bible itself.

The Church, then, when in gathering its Canon asked the question, 'Does this book preach?' meant 'Does it authoritatively teach the truth *about Christ*?' In other words, the Bible, like other Canons, is held to be authoritative for a *given religion*. This, of course, implies a certain limitation of its authority. We have come, after no small trouble, to see that the Bible is not authoritative in science. It is also widely admitted that it is not necessarily authoritative in history. As has already been seen, the Jew attached little importance to history *per se*. For instance, apart from the two brief periods that centre respectively in Zerubbabel and Nehemiah, the Old Testament has no account of the history of Israel after the Fall of Jerusalem in 587 B.C., for Hebrew history in and after the Exile seemed rather to present problems than to preach truths. Similarly, the first Christians were not careful to give a complete account of the history of the First Christian Century, or even of the human life of our Lord Himself. Again, it is idle to seek in the Bible an authoritative political or social theory. Yet this is not the whole case. Since the Bible is for Christians 'The Book of Religion', and since for them religion covers the whole of life, they do claim that the Bible asserts or implies some things that concern all knowledge—science and history and politics and so on. For instance, Christians are bound to combat any science that claims that there is no room for God in modern knowledge, or a history that reduces Jesus to a mere man, or a materialistic politics, like Marxism, or a social theory that denies, like Hitlerism, the value of every human being, whatever his colour or race. Here, of course, there is a mass of problems that it would be out-of-place to discuss at length, but it needs to be stated that, while the authority of the Bible is limited to religion, religion has yet things to say that are fundamental for *the whole of life*. To put the same truth negatively, it is to be admitted that if, for instance, history should some day show that there never was such a man as Jesus of Nazareth, or science should reduce ethics to mechanism, Christianity would perish. Happily there are no signs of such a catastrophe. No statements about the future can be

'proved' in the same way as statements about the past or present, but, while many Christians have a firm belief, for instance, that Hitler will be defeated in the present war, it is a shaky conviction compared to their belief that the future belongs to 'our Lord Jesus Christ'. 'Jesus Christ is the same, yesterday, to-day, yea, and for ever'.

'The same yesterday.' Christianity looks to the past as well as to the future. In other words, it is an *historic* religion, and builds on the greatest of historic events, the Incarnation of the Son of God. For Christians the Old Testament describes the way in which the way was made ready for this, and the New Testament describes and expounds the event itself, for the Life, Death, Resurrection and Ascension of Jesus, and the giving of the Holy Spirit, are all parts of one event in history. It is agreed among us that the one task of the Christian preacher is to proclaim this event and explain its meaning for the men of to-day. Two consequences ensue. First, the uninterrupted use of the Bible by all Christians through many centuries has played a leading part in the maintenance of the organic *continuity* of the Church in history. While Christians agree that this continuity depends upon the constant witness of the Spirit to the Christ, there is difference about the part played in it by an uninterrupted line of Popes or of bishops or of those whom the New Testament calls 'saints'. Yet all Christians believe that the organic continuity of the history of the Church from the time of its Founder till to-day, is one of the things that are fundamental in Christianity. To venture to use a Latin phrase, '*Sine continuitate, nulla ecclesia*'. The perennial use of the Bible has been a chief means by which the Holy Spirit has maintained and does maintain this continuity. Again, the Bible belongs to the *whole* Church. It has thereby been a chief means of maintaining a large degree of unity amid many divisions. The use of the Bible by all Christians as their authoritative book does show that, in spite of differences, there are many things, and these among the most important, about which all Christians agree—a truth that we need to emphasize as we face the world to-day, for the world seems sometimes to take it for granted that we do nothing but disagree! The Bible unites all Christians, of all ages and peoples and languages and cultures—and *Churches*. The very fact that we sometimes dispute about its meaning shows that it belongs to us all, for people rarely dispute hotly about anything that is not dear to all the disputants.

So far the word 'authoritative' has been used as though its meaning were well understood. There is truth in the assumption, yet, of course, the problem of 'authority' is always with us. While it is impossible to discuss this problem fully here, something ought to be said about it. First, perhaps, we ought to note that, strictly speaking, the phrase 'authoritative book' is inaccurate. No book, *qua* book, can be authoritative, for authority is intrinsically personal. The Bible owes its authority to the *men* whose teaching it records. Its authority is derivative, going back always to authoritative men. This is true even when, as, for instance, with the prophecies contained in the later part of the Book of the Prophet Isaiah or the Epistle to the Hebrews, the very names of the men are forgotten. It is sometimes said that there was a Church before there was a Bible. This is true, but it is not true that there was a Church before there were authoritative men.

Again, when the problem of the authority of the Bible—or rather of the men

whose teaching it records—is discussed, it is not always rightly stated. It is often tacitly assumed that there is here an instance of ‘authority’ that is unique. This is true, but at what point is our Canon unique? In its subject-matter, and not in its nature. To show this it may be worth while to look at another example of authority. When a sick man consults a doctor he is appealing to authority. Yet it is far too simple to say merely that the doctor is an ‘authoritative man’ in the realm of medicine. Behind him there is an authoritative community, called the Medical Association. A particular doctor is authoritative because he has its *imprimatur*. Yet it is also true that in diagnosing a particular disease and prescribing for it, he does something individual. Both a particular man and a particular society exercise authority. There is also a third element in the complex situation. The patient decides for himself whether he will accept this dual authority. In other words, there is a place for ‘private judgement’, for freedom as well as for authority. The reasons for which the patient accepts authority vary. He may have enough medical knowledge to be able himself to check the doctor’s decisions; or he may rely upon his neighbours’ evidence that this particular doctor is ‘a good doctor’; or he may just choose to accept his authority because he has been ‘properly trained’—that is, because he has the authority of the medical community behind him. But, while the grounds of the patient’s submission may vary, it is always true that he himself chooses to submit. It is probable that in every instance of the phenomenon of authority in human life these three things at least—the authority of a community, the authority of an individual, and the consent of the ‘subject’ of authority—are present in some degree. Again, apart from the case of young children (who are not yet fully personal), this ought to be so. Further, in the instance examined, as in others, there is the acceptance of an authority for which no claim of infallibility is made. Both the community of medical men, and the particular doctor, and the patient, know quite well that a mistake may be made. It hardly needs to be added that most of the problems that invest the subject of authority relate to the part that each of the three elements named ought to take in the complex of the whole. Here it is only possible summarily to make four remarks. First, it is as idle to discuss which of the three elements is primary as to discuss whether hydrogen or sulphur or oxygen is primary in sulphuric acid. Next, in spite of the fact that there are unresolved and perhaps unresolvable problems in all instances of the use of authority, men do go on using it. Indeed, it is impossible for any man to escape the use of it, however much he may claim to do so. Third, in spite of frequent and sometimes frightful abuses, the use of authority, taken by and large, justifies itself. It passes ‘the pragmatic test’—it ‘works’, and ‘works’ to an end that is good. If physical health were not good, what need of doctors? Fourth, the complexity of the nature of authority need not mean that it cannot work easily and smoothly. How many machines, which are just as complex, do both! Many a man who, in his ignorance of motoring, has gazed wonderingly at the ‘insides’ of a motor-car, has travelled easily and smoothly in it for many miles.

We may now apply this to our subject, taking the points in a different order. In spite of the complexity of the authority of the Bible, and in spite of the controversies that have sometimes gathered round it, it has, on the whole, ‘worked’ easily and smoothly. The story of the Bible Society is full of instances

of this. In the vast majority of Christian congregations, again, the authority of the Bible is accepted as a matter of course. As for the controversies, have they been more numerous and intractable than those about authority in the State? Again, the use of the Bible has 'worked' to its proper end—the publishing of the Gospel of God in Christ. Is there anything that meets the 'pragmatic test' better—anything, at any rate, in the realm of the mind, as distinct from the body? Once more, is it not true that the doctrine of the authority of the Bible involves the same three elements as other instances of authority—an authoritative community, an authoritative individual, and the use of 'private judgement'? This means that the *differentia* of the authority of the Bible does not lie in the *nature* of its authority. It lies in the *subject* to which the authority relates, religion. In other words, it deals with the paramount *subjects* of God and the relation between God and man, here and hereafter. Many have thought that for this subject God must have given men an infallible authority, and some have found this in the Bible. But it has not pleased God to give men an infallible authority even in religion. This, of course, does not mean that God Himself is not infallible, or that Christ is not, but only that God has not given us any organ by which we may infallibly know His will in any given situation, or any means by which we may be infallibly sure that His Son said this or that. The truth, of course, is that if there were any infallible organ of God's authority, men would be robbed of the high discipline of thinking for themselves. It may seem to some that, when we speak of the preacher—that is, of the 'authoritative individual' within the complex of authority as a whole—there is something peculiar in his conviction that he, as an individual, is 'called of God' to preach. Yet many will claim that here too the *differentia* lies, not in the *nature* of the call, but in its *substance*. Once, when a minister was talking to a Christian leather-manufacturer, the latter said: 'I am called of God to be a tanner as much as you are called to be a minister'. Surely every Christian's 'occupation' ought consciously to be his 'vocation'. At least it will be admitted that this should be so with artists and doctors and teachers. The *differentia* of the preacher is that he humbly believes that he is called to the highest of human enterprises—to 'beseech' men 'on behalf of Christ' to be 'reconciled to God'. It need hardly be said that such a conviction does not induce any 'superiority complex' but drives a man to his knees. How can he do other than cry with Isaiah, 'Woe is me!' and with Paul, 'Who is sufficient for these things?' The answer comes, 'Our sufficiency is of God'. This means that no Christian minister will usually preach anything just because it is his own conviction, however confidently he holds it. He will only preach what he believes has been taught him by the Holy Spirit. There may perhaps be rare occasions when he feels that he must interpolate an opinion of his own, for Paul does this twice in his Epistles (1 Cor. vii. 12; 2 Cor. xi. 17), yet a Christian minister, like the Apostle, will very rarely intrude his own personal convictions upon his preaching, and if he does, he will make the fact that he is doing so very plain. But there is here at most an 'exception that proves the rule'. A Christian minister humbly believes that his message is the message of Christ Himself. Inasmuch as the criterion here is the record of what Christ said, what Christ was, what Christ did, his message must root in the Bible. Without it, he would be lost. This does not mean that there will be nothing new in his message, for, as John Robinson said

to the Pilgrim Fathers, 'new light' is always 'breaking out of the word of God', but it does define the nature of the new message—it will be always and only the application of the historic 'word of the Lord' to the new circumstances of new times. We must 'guard the deposit', but, unlike some bankers' deposits to-day, it is a deposit that bears interest, and it is for us to use the interest for the benefit of our hearers. For a Christian minister to 'air his own views' in the pulpit is a kind of blasphemy. He does not, of course, claim to be infallible, but he does claim that, so far as it lies in him to do so, he is saying what Christ would say if He were in the pulpit. To claim that he has a message from Christ that does not root in the Bible is to give up the claim that Christianity is an historic religion.

It is not enough, however, that the Christian preacher should believe that he is 'sent of God'; it is necessary that his hearers should believe this too. It is necessary, indeed, both that the community called the Church should believe this, and that each individual hearer, using private judgement, should believe it for himself. In both cases there is an appeal to the Bible, or rather there is an appeal to the Christ through the Bible. With the Church this is explicit, for it is a community with a canon. How should any man preach to the 'Body of Christ' what is not derived from its 'head', Christ Himself? It is the same, at least implicitly, though in another way, with the individual hearer. Whether he is already a confessed Christian or an 'outsider' who is willing to listen to a Christian preacher, the 'one thing needful' for him is the conviction, 'What this man is saying is what Christ says to me'. However confusedly or subconsciously, our hearers know that Christianity is a historic religion—in other words, that, unless some 'of old time' had known Christ 'in the flesh', no one could certainly know His will at all. Where but in the Bible can men learn what is 'the mind of Christ'?

In passing it may be recalled that during the last generation the 'note of authority' has been largely in abeyance in preaching. There are several reasons. It would be out-of-place to discuss them here, but one of them, though not the chief, is the prevalence of discussions about the Bible. This difficulty, however, has begun to pass, for the modern examination of the Bible, having done its negative work, is now yielding positive results. This means that, while we do not state the grounds of the authority of the Bible in the same way as our fathers, it is even more clearly than before 'The Word of God'. May the 'note of authority' return to preaching! This does not mean that preachers should assert their authority, while hearers rather reluctantly accept it, for authority, at its best, does not need to be asserted. It means rather that, on the one hand, a preacher should pass into the pulpit saying in his heart: 'All things are possible to God. May He speak through me, even me!', and that, on the other hand, the hearer, when he sees a preacher step into the pulpit, should just take it happily for granted that this is a 'man of God'. A few months ago a child of three years of age was taken to church for the first time. He had been told that he was going to 'the house of God', and, when the preacher, sitting down while the collection was made, chanced to be lost to view, he whispered to his mother, 'Mummy, where has God gone?' Such a remark would, of course, be blasphemy in an adult, but it ought to be with painful surprise that any Christian should think as he listens to a sermon, 'I am not now listening to the word of Christ'.

In recent discussions of the New Testament it has been shown that fundamentally it is *kerugma*. The word, of course, goes back to the message of a herald. This was not primarily discussion or argument. Still less did a herald say anything of his own. It was his one duty authoritatively to proclaim the message of another and greater. This was the primary function of the first heralds of the Christian faith. They were 'authoritative men', and they proclaimed just one thing—that there is a 'name given under heaven whereby [men] must be saved'. This is still the fundamental task of the Christian preacher, and one does not wonder that at times some ask whether the note of 'the herald' has not been largely lost. Yet to set the 'herald' over against the 'teacher' is to be false to the New Testament. In one of Paul's greatest passages, he compares the Christian preacher to an 'ambassador', and it is often an ambassador's business to explain authoritatively what his sovereign has to say. In point of fact, the New Testament is both *kerugma* and teaching. A rough count will show that in it the Greek verb 'herald' (*kērussein*) occurs about sixty times, and the verb 'teach' (*didaskein*) nearly a hundred times. Yet, while it is a preacher's business to teach as well as to herald, teaching is ancillary to *kerugma*. Is it not through the New Testament, or as some would say, through the Church with the New Testament in its hands, that men learn both the *kerugma* and the right way to explain it? 'The Bible and Preaching' go indissolubly together, as indissolubly as oxygen and hydrogen in water. John the Baptist, the first herald of the Christ, once compared his greater successor to a bridegroom and himself to the bridegroom's friend. There is a famous picture—by one of the Breughels—that portrays a wedding feast in a Dutch village. The picture is a strange one, for at this wedding the bridegroom is hidden behind a bustling serving-man! Is there not here a dread parable for preachers? On the other hand, every Christian preacher is heir to the pure and disinterested joy of the Baptist. He too may be able to say, '*I decrease, but He increases*'.

C. RYDER SMITH

R. W. DALE

WHEN R. W. Dale—'Dale of Birmingham', as he was commonly called—passed away, it was justly said of him that no Nonconformist of the century had left behind him a more splendid and stainless name. And now that we are further from him and can see the past in truer perspective, the judgement still stands: Dale was beyond controversy the greatest Nonconformist—or, as we should rather say to-day, the greatest Free Churchman—of the nineteenth century. But nearly fifty years have passed—he died in 1895—since the grave closed over him; the dust is gathering on his books; the youth of this generation is turning to other teachers for its guidance. It is idle to mourn over what is the common lot of all things mortal:

Year by year our memory fades
From all the circle of the hills.

Yet those of us who owe so much and such great things to Dale's inspiration would faint, if we could, arrest the inevitable descent into forgetfulness.

I

I never saw Dale, never heard him, never—except through his books—had any kind of communication with him. What may seem a still graver disqualification for writing of him is that to me, as to many others, a good deal of his theology no longer makes any appeal. Even the famous Lectures on the Atonement, which at one time were a kind of unofficial text-book on the subject in Evangelical circles, are little read now, and are more often to be seen in secondhand bookshops than on the shelves of our younger ministers. Yet, for myself, I rank Dale the Congregationalist, along with Church the Anglican, McLaren the Baptist, and Denney the Presbyterian, among the chief inspirers of my life both as a Christian man and a Christian minister. I not only purchased his books but, with one or two unimportant exceptions, they all, to the number of something like a score, still keep their place in my now dwindling library. Indeed, so great was my enthusiasm, and so good did I find it to be under his influence, that when I picked up several volumes of the old *Congregationalist*, of which he was at one time the editor, I cut out all his contributions and had them bound in two cloth volumes which I still possess. I may be pardoned for mentioning another personal item. Some forty years ago, about the time when Dale's influence over me was at its height, I was invited to deliver an address at Middletown University, U.S.A., on the occasion of the two hundredth anniversary of John Wesley's birth. I took for my subject *The Old Methodism and the New*, the title itself being suggested by Dale's *The Old Evangelicalism and the New*, and all its contents being coloured by what I had learned from him. When afterwards it appeared in book form, one reviewer, I remember, described it as 'Dale-ish'. I made no demur to the word, since without him the address could hardly have been written at all. Yet another personal item tells the same tale. With this article in mind I have recently re-read a number of Dale's books, and again and again in doing so I have been interested, and sometimes amused to come upon phrases, sentences and ideas, which I was almost inclined to claim as my own, so familiar and so much akin to my own way of thinking did they seem! The fact is, of course, that so completely had they taken possession of me that, all unconsciously, I had come to regard them as part of my own mental furniture! Is it any marvel, then, that after the long lapse of years it still seems worth while trying to explain to the readers of this generation why we older men set so great store by the name of Robert William Dale?

II

Before I go on to speak of some of Dale's books, there is one, not by him but about him, which must be named and with which any reader coming to the subject for the first time will be well advised to begin: I mean, of course, the *Life* by his son, the late Sir A. W. W. Dale. Our best Free Church biographies during recent years seem to have come out of Scotland. A. R. MacEwen's *John Cairns*, Carnegie Simpson's *Principal Rainy*, G. F. Barbour's *Alexander Whyte*: I can think of no English Free Church biography quite worthy to stand in this high company except Dale's. When it first appeared, his personal friend, P. T. Forsyth, wrote of it in this *Quarterly* as 'one of the foremost religious books of the time', its workmanship 'as nearly perfect as possible'. This was high

praise, but not too high; if there is any book which deserves to be called a classic of modern English Nonconformity, this is it. Inevitably, of course, the mere passage of the years has robbed some of the chapters of the warmth and vitality which they had for both the writer and his readers half a century ago. The marvel is that there is so little dead wood in the tree. Whether the *Life* be read as a document of English Free Church life in the nineteenth century, or the revelation of the mind and heart of a good man and a great preacher, it is beyond price.

Turning now to Dale's own books, there are some which, in a survey like this, must needs pass unnoticed altogether: *The Life and Letters of J. Angell James*, his distinguished predecessor at Carr's Lane Chapel; *Impressions of Australia*; a Hymn-book compiled for the use of his own congregation; the posthumous *History of English Congregationalism*; and some others. There are three volumes of New Testament exposition: *The Jewish Temple and the Christian Church: a Series of Discourses on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, the first-fruits of his Birmingham ministry (1865); *The Epistle to the Ephesians: Its Doctrines and Ethics*; and *The Epistle of James*, which he did not live to complete. Near the end of his life Dale said to a friend of his *Ephesians*: 'It is the book of mine that I like best; Paul found me the material, and I had nothing to do but to say over again what he had already said'. When Dr. G. G. Findlay had finished his book on the same Epistle, written for the 'Expositor's Bible', a copy of it sent to Dale called forth this acknowledgement:

I shall read it with great interest. I hope that you had as much delight in working at the Epistle as I had. Some parts of it intoxicated me; whether I was in the body or out of the body, I could hardly tell; but when it came to writing what one had seen, the colours had faded and the glory was extinguished.

When Dale died, Robertson Nicoll wrote in the *British Weekly*: 'On the whole there are no contributions to Christian theology made in our time so likely to endure as the series of volumes which includes *The Living Christ and the Four Gospels*, and *Christian Doctrine*'. But I am afraid the melancholy truth is that what has already been said about Dale's better known book on the Atonement is even more true of his *Christian Doctrine*. Nor does the neglect necessarily argue want of interest in the subject. In a brief but welcome preface which Dale wrote for his book, he tells how, soon after his settlement in Birmingham, he met an older ministerial friend who talked to him in a friendly way about his ministry. 'I hear', he said, 'that you are preaching doctrinal sermons to the congregation at Carr's Lane; they will not stand it'. Dale answered, 'They will have to stand it'. 'There was too much of the insolent self-confidence of youth', was his later comment, 'in both the temper and the form of my reply; but the conception of the ministry which it expressed was, I believe, a just one—as far as it went; and it is a conception which, with more or less fidelity, I have endeavoured to fulfil.' And, he continues, 'so far from finding that a congregation will not "stand" doctrinal sermons, my experience is that such sermons, if of moderate length, are of great interest to large numbers of Christian people'. Substantially, I believe, that is true still, as the experience of preachers like the Archbishop of Canterbury and Dr. J. S. Whale pretty plainly shows. But few things 'date' so quickly as our theologies, and nothing is more unreadable

and unread than the theology of the day before yesterday. The other book which Nicoll named—*The Living Christ and the Four Gospels*—has suffered a good deal less through the changes in the fashion of our theological thought, and it is hard to believe that any earnest reader coming to it to-day will not find his spirit stirred and quickened by its glowing pages. It was of this book that Dale himself told the story how, when he was writing an Easter sermon, the thought of the risen Lord broke in upon him as it had never done before : 'Christ is alive!' I need not go further with the story, for by this time it has probably become the best known pulpit story of the last fifty years. 'What a good thing,' some old lady is reported to have said, after listening to it for the nth time, 'what a good thing it was for our ministers that Dr. Dale wrote that book !'

But if Dale's doctrine has not the attraction for us that it had for his Evangelical contemporaries, there is no Christian minister who may not learn from him how to handle the hardly less difficult and equally important subject of Christian Ethics. His *Laws of Christ for Common Life*, in which he discusses such themes as 'The Forgiveness of Injuries', 'Temptation', 'Sympathy', 'Family Life', 'Political and Municipal Duty', closing with an appeal for 'An Ethical Revival', is for me one of the most beautiful and attractive of all his books. Then there are the various volumes in which some of the greatest of his occasional sermons are to be found, notably the volume entitled *Fellowship with Christ*. Finally, I must mention the Yale *Lectures on Preaching*. And here we have his son's authority for saying that probably no other of Dale's books has been read with equal appreciation by men of so many theological schools. Not a little of its charm is due to its numerous autobiographical touches. Dale was not given to talking about himself; 'the personal note is rarely heard' in his books. 'But here, speaking to younger men, and on a subject that gave him a right to speak for himself and of himself, he was less rigorous in self-repression'; so that a stranger, unacquainted with his history, would learn more about him from these lectures than from any other of his writings. How little they have aged with the years is suggested by the fact that, after sixty-five years, they still keep their place among the books recommended by our Conference for the reading of Probationers.

III

Yet, numerous as were Dale's writings, and serviceable as they have proved themselves to be to multitudes of Christian readers in all parts of the English-speaking world, and beyond it—for translations have appeared in at least French, German and Japanese—it was as a preacher that the supreme work of his life was done. Indeed, with but few exceptions, all his books were prepared and written with the pulpit in view. The pulpit was his throne, and all his life through, both by precept and by practice, he steadfastly upheld our great Free Church traditions regarding its place in our religious life and worship. 'Be of good courage', he wrote to a brother minister; 'if a man has anything to say from God to the people, they will come to hear him, and their hearts will be touched'. And in that conviction he never wavered. One little incident, trifling enough in itself, shows with what jealousy he looked upon anything that threatened the primacy of the pulpit. He had taken a foremost

part in the founding of Mansfield College, Oxford. When the Chapel was approaching completion, these two notes, which are self-explanatory, were sent by him to his friend, Principal Fairbairn:

I was dismayed when Albert Spicer told me that it was proposed to put the pulpit at the corner of the [stone] platform. I always understood that we were to have a desk in the middle at the front, and that for the Communion service it would be pushed aside. For us to have a pulpit so placed as to leave the 'altar' visible to the congregation is nothing less than a scandal; and to put the preacher cross-wise for the sake of this is not only to dishonour the function of preaching but to impair its efficiency.

If it is quite certain that the voice cannot be heard except from the corner, *cadit quaestio*; but it is a miserable humiliation that we have not been able to build a little place like that fit for its main purpose. I wonder what would be said of architect and building committee, if after they had erected a concert hall, a fiddler could be heard only when he stood in a corner.

Dale's own preaching, as Fairbairn justly observes, recalls 'the heroic age of the English sermon'. This is so even though we apply to it only the rude measure of the yardstick. Thus, a sermon which he preached 'before the Directors of the London Missionary Society' in 1864 occupied two hours in delivery and filled fifty-six pages of the volume, *Discourses on Special Occasions*, in which it was afterwards printed. *The Old Evangelicalism and the New*, 'a Discourse delivered in Argyle Chapel, Bath, on the Occasion of the Hundredth Anniversary of its Opening', is but little shorter. We are brought still nearer the pulpit's 'heroic age' if regard be had not merely to the length of Dale's sermons but to their subject-matter. Take, for example, *The Living Christ and the Four Gospels*. Six of its fourteen chapters were delivered to the Carr's Lane congregation at the morning service, the rest at the usual Thursday evening service. Similarly, the lectures on Ephesians, Dale tells us, were delivered on Sunday mornings, in the ordinary course of his ministry, but one or two of them, he adds, 'were obviously too long for endurance in these times, though they would have been regarded as abnormally brief by the robust ecclesiastical ancestors of the congregation of which I am the minister'. Still more astonishing is the fact made known by his son that the lectures on the Atonement, originally delivered in London, were repeated 'at Carr's Lane, week after week for nearly three months', and that the building was crowded from end to end 'without any diminution of interest'.

It may be of interest to the sermon-taster to learn that the sermon which Dale himself reckoned his 'best'—'best', that is, in the sense that he had succeeded in saying what he wished to say on a subject of paramount and permanent interest, and that he had said it in a way likely to carry conviction or at least to compel attention—is that entitled 'Christ and the State', now to be read in his *Fellowship with Christ*. But, if I may say so, it is a preference which I am wholly at a loss to understand. As I have already indicated, I have no memories of my own of Dale's preaching, but the sermon which I should most wish to have heard is that on 'The Risen Christ', preached in the old Great Queen Street Chapel, London, in May, 1889. I remember well how it moved me when I read it in the old *British Weekly Pulpit*, and I still sometimes see

something of the glory of that great hour in the shining faces of men now grown old as they recall what Dale's son has so vividly described :

At Queen Street—among the Methodists—the whole tide was with him. Midway in his course, as he drew towards the close of a passage of sustained grandeur, recalling the succession of saints and sinners who in their own conscious experience have prolonged the Gospel narrative, adding to its records new miracles of mercy and of power, wave upon wave of emotion broke over the assembly. The argument and the appeal exactly suited the genius of Methodism. Those who listened could bear their own testimony : they too had felt, had seen, had known. With them, mind and heart and spirit made one music.

Like all the rest of us who try to preach, Dale had, of course, his limitations. 'He never was,' his son says, 'and never could have been a children's preacher. He made more than one attempt, but his sermons to children, though simple in language, were seldom simple in thought ; and he never possessed the passport that admits the stranger into the unknown country of a child's mind'. Nor had he—such, at least, was his own judgement—the gifts of an evangelist. He undertook on occasion special missions, but experience satisfied him that he had not been called to this form of service ; and he abandoned the work, not because he underestimated its necessity or its value, but because he lacked the distinctive powers that it required. On the other hand, when Moody and Sankey visited Birmingham for their great mission in 1875, no one threw himself more whole-heartedly into it than did Dale, and perhaps there are few things that he ever wrote which are better worth reading than the articles in *The Congregationalist* in which he described and defended the evangelists and their work. One short passage speaks of his own experiences in the 'inquiry-room' :

I had seen occasional instances before of instant transition from religious anxiety to the clear and triumphant consciousness of restoration to God ; but what struck me in the gallery of Bingley Hall was the fact that this instant transition took place with nearly every person with whom I talked. They had come up into the gallery anxious, restless, feeling after God in the darkness, and when, after a conversation of a quarter of an hour or twenty minutes, they went away, their faces were filled with light, and they left me not only at peace with God but filled with joy. I have seen the sunrise from the top of Helvellyn and the top of the Righi, and there is something very glorious in it ; but to see the light of heaven suddenly strike on man after man in the course of one evening is very much more thrilling. These people carried their new joy with them to their homes and their workshops. It could not be hid.

Neither should the sequel be forgotten. Writing to a friend nearly ten years later Dale was able to say : 'From first to last in 1875 I received about two hundred Moody converts, and I reckon that seventy-five per cent of them have stood well'.

One of the most constant characteristics of Dale's preaching was the fashion in which, throughout his whole ministry, doctrine and ethics were interwoven. It has been said of Principal Rainy's preaching that it was preaching that made men think about God—God in Christ, God in history, God in experience—and therefore, whatever other qualities it may have had or have lacked, it always had greatness in it. The same may be said of the preaching of Dale : it made men think about God. But, equally, it made them think about themselves, about their fellows, and about the duties which they

owed them. Nothing hurt him more than the frequency and the apparent ease with which some Christian teachers put asunder the two things which God has for ever joined together—conduct and creed, ethics and theology. He was a true son and disciple of the Evangelical Revival of the eighteenth century, and he gloried without ceasing in the greatness of its accomplishments: but in its moral aims and achievements it seemed to him gravely defective; it had, he thought, 'no ethical originality'. It was to guard against this defect, whether on the ethical or the doctrinal side, that he would sometimes draw up a list of some of the subjects on which he resolved to preach during the following twelve months. Under doctrine he would set down such themes as The Divinity of Christ, Sin, Faith, Regeneration, Judgement to come; under ethics, Truth, Magnanimity, Temperance, Public Spirit, Contentment. It is significant and wholly typical that in the last months of his ministry he was dealing side by side with the practical precepts of the Epistle of James and the profound topics which form the theme of his *Christian Doctrine*.

In discussing Dale as a preacher it seems inevitable that some reference should be made to his style, in praise of which so much has justly been said. It was always vigorous, impassioned, lucid; always noble, befitting the lofty plane on which his thought habitually moved. Indeed, Robertson Nicoll once went so far as to speak of it as 'one of the most perfect styles in the whole range of English literature'. But this is surely the language of excess. A style—like that of Dale's master, Edmund Burke, for example—may be admirable in itself and yet not suited to the pulpit. If terseness, clearness, directness are the foundation-virtues of the pulpit, as they surely are, Dale was a richly endowed man. In what he added to these things he was perhaps not so fortunate. An example will best show what I mean. In a sermon on the Trinity, in his *Christian Doctrine*, there is a passage which moved Dr. Thorold, then Bishop of Winchester, to say that he doubted if there was another man living, and not many dead, who could have written it. The passage is much too long to quote here, but most readers, I think, much as they may admire its sustained and lofty eloquence, will feel that it is too eloquent, that the preacher in his delight in fashioning and adorning the instrument in his hands, has momentarily lost sight of the end for which all our pulpit-instruments exist. One naturally hesitates to pass a criticism like this on a preacher like Dale, and I should hesitate still more if it were not for a shrewd and striking bit of self-criticism which Dale's son has preserved for us:

Is it too early to record the hope that God has given to me a new element of power in my preaching? The word which has been often used to denote what critics regarded as the excellence of my preaching and speaking really suggested the qualities in which both had been defective, and the preaching more than the speaking—'stateliness'. That is not the characteristic of effective preaching; and it suggests a whole set of intellectual and spiritual elements which account for failure. I think that in the sermons of the last two Sundays the 'stateliness' has disappeared, and that there has been more of brotherly access—intellectual, and, if I may so put it, rhetorical access—to the people. The intellectual quality has not, I think, been inferior to what I have usually reached, but on the whole higher; but the 'stateliness' has gone. In preparation I aimed at more freedom, and in preaching, God gave it me.

Modern preaching does not run to 'eloquence' as it did fifty years ago; but the

preacher with leanings and gifts that way will do well to lay Dale's words to heart.

IV

There is one aspect of Dale's life and work in Birmingham which it is impossible to ignore even in a survey as brief and inadequate as the present, but which raises at once large and debatable issues which at the moment I must studiously avoid. I refer to the large part which he took, and which by his teaching and example he encouraged others to take, in the public life—educational, municipal and political—of his city. Few of his sayings perhaps were more readily caught up and repeated than some in which he poured scorn on professing Christians who accepted and enjoyed the fruits of the public service of others and yet looked upon all political activity as a thing unclean. He thought it possible that the time might come when Church members who refused to vote would be subjected to Church discipline, like men who refuse to pay their debts. In the United States it appeared to him as if rogues did public work in order to make money, while honest men neglected public work in order to save money. Judged by the laws of public morality, he was not sure who were the worse! So great and far-reaching was his own political activity and influence that when Joseph Chamberlain was first returned to Parliament, one London newspaper declared that he went there as the nominee and representative of R. W. Dale, to which Chamberlain retorted, in a speech to his constituents, 'Well, if that be so, there is not a member of the House of Commons who will have a better, wiser or nobler constituency'.

But there is another side to all this which cannot be passed over if the whole truth about Dale is to be told. All through the later years of his ministry he was haunted by misgivings that would not be silenced that he had devoted too much of his time and energy to the actual conflicts of political life, that he might have done more for the Church, whose servant he was, if he had attempted less for the State. The 'ghost' came to him, he tells us, when he was studying the later history of Puritanism. Why had its fires so swiftly burnt themselves out? Did the explanation lie here—in the premature attempt to apply to the political order the laws of a diviner kingdom and to do it by direct political action? At another time he was going over some early articles from his own pen and was puzzled to come upon a paragraph in which he deprecated the waste of strength occasioned by intermeddling with politics and other matters lying outside the direct line of ministerial work. 'It seemed odd,' he comments sadly, 'that at the beginning of my ministry I should have seen—apparently with such clearness—the truth which has come home to me, as if it were quite fresh and unfamiliar, at the close of it. It is a clear case of seeing the better path and choosing the worse. Alas! Alas!' Yet again, in that 'best sermon' on 'Christ and the State' to which I have already referred, he makes a pointed contrast between political and social schemes which are full of promise but turn out to be mischievous, and the work of winning individual men to Christ: there, he says, 'we cannot go wrong'. John Wesley and George Whitefield did more for the social redemption of England than all the politicians of this century and the last, whose names are associated with great reforms; under God they created those moral and spiritual forces which have

rendered all reforms possible.' And if further evidence on the point be still needed, I have been told that once, in a Birmingham ministers' meeting, Dale lamented with something like bitterness that he had not chosen what he now felt to be the better part; and that when a member of the meeting endeavoured to soothe him by saying that he had been true to the light which then he had, he refused to be comforted: if he had been a better man, he said, he would have had clearer light. And so it came about that when, in the nineties of the last century, the Free Church Council was called into being, to the perplexity and pain of many of his old friends, Dale felt himself compelled to hold aloof. The line to be taken, he said, is this: 'The Churches should do all they can in the power of the grace and truth of Christ to renew and sanctify all whom they reach; and that then Christian men—as citizens, not as members of Churches—should appear in the community to discharge their duties to it, under the control of the spirit and law of Christ'.

We are on the very verge of very debatable territory, if indeed we have not already entered it, and I must go no further. Only this word needs to be added: these misgivings of Dale's meant something more than the passing of the generous ardours of his early faith; they possessed him at a time when some of the finest of his pulpit work was being done; they were, as his friend Forsyth said, the settled convictions of his latest years, and no estimate of him is complete which leaves them out of the reckoning.

V

Writing in a Methodist *Quarterly* it is not unfitting, I hope, that my closing word should be of Dale's attitude to Methodism. It must not be forgotten that he traced his spiritual lineage to a double source, nor would it be easy to say to which his debt was the greater. He delighted to remember that Congregationalism has its roots in a remoter past, and is the representative of an earlier and, in some respects, a greater religious movement than Methodism:

Puritanism had a majesty and grandeur to which Evangelicalism could lay no claim. It had profounder learning, and more friendly relations to all the provinces of human thought, and all the triumphs of human genius. It had more intellectual vigour and courage. It had a loftier and more masculine moral ideal. It encouraged a profounder religious life.

Yet no man recalled more gratefully than he that when the descendants of the Puritans had declined from the greatness of their fathers, it was the Evangelical Revival of the eighteenth century which gave them new life, and he never wearied in proclaiming the greatness of the services which the Revival rendered to the religious life of the whole nation.

Dale's biographer is, I believe, right in saying that at one time the leaders of Wesleyan methodism looked upon him with no little suspicion and mistrust. He was a political leader, and in their eyes a political leader on the wrong side. The change came at the Birmingham Conference of 1879, when Dale addressed the members on the services that Methodism had rendered to Christianity in England, with special reference to the value of some of its characteristic institutions. 'It may be said without fear of challenge,' writes his son, 'that the address of that morning placed Dale in an entirely new light before the

MIGHT AND RIGHT

leaders of Wesleyan Methodism; that from that day they regarded him as one of their most loyal allies; and that for many years there was no man outside their own body who was held in greater honour by all sections of the Methodist community.' It was at this same Conference, too, that from the pulpit of his own church Dale delivered the great sermon on 'The Evangelical Revival' which afterwards gave both title and keynote to the volume which contained it. Alike in his Conference address and in this sermon, as elsewhere in his writings, he emphasized the value of the class-meeting, which he admired and coveted above all other Methodist institutions. It is, he said, 'the most striking and original of all the fruits of the Revival. It was not invented; it was the creation of the circumstances in which the Revival was carried on; it was a natural product of the soil; and the Methodist people should take good heed how they treat so precious and wonderful a growth.' 'We hold you,' he told the Conference, 'responsible for preserving in its entirety the essential principle and genius of this institution.'

But admiration did not silence the voice of the critic. Great as were the services of the Evangelical Revival, it seemed to Dale to be defective both ecclesiastically and ethically. It had failed to assign to the Church its due place in the spiritual life, and in particular it had given too little thought to character and conduct.

There was one doctrine of John Wesley's—the doctrine of perfect sanctification—which ought to have led to a great and original ethical development; but the doctrine has not grown; it seems to remain just where John Wesley left it. There has been a want of the genius or the courage to attempt the solution of the immense practical questions which the doctrine suggests. The questions have not been raised—much less solved.

And there we must take leave of this great prince of the Church. I began this appreciation thinking that at least I might be able to interest a few of those to whom the name of Dale is still a dear and cherished memory; I end it not without the hope that what I have written may convince some younger readers that God may still have some word to speak through the lips of this good and faithful servant of his city, his Church, and his Lord.

GEORGE JACKSON

MIGHT AND RIGHT

ONE of the stock remarks during the present war is that we are engaged in a spiritual conflict. The armies in the field are the products and agents of Ideas. If this be so, must not victory or defeat be interpreted spiritually? Certain Ideas will win or lose. Such a consideration leads to a most momentous question. Will victory justify one set of principles and invalidate another? Concretely, if Germany and her allies win the war, are her doctrines and ideals vindicated? If we are beaten, are ours discredited? If the struggle should end in a draw, in a peace 'by negotiation', must we conclude that the principles of both sets of combatants were a mixture of right and wrong? That there was good on both sides and that the belligerents ought to learn from one another? As a result of this repercussion Germany would copy some of our good points

and we
while
Machi
zation

It w
probler
mankin
peculiar

Is M
that co
questio
the ca
The o
righted
phras
But if
in its
men, i
like a
precisi
convinc
succes
abuso
as a c
Carly
openb
the ba

If C
Englis
Hone
hones
On

a ma
does

The
are n
a bett
unifor
action
this w
cours
has p
from
supp
Be

recal

and we some of hers. She, let us say, might with advantage become more moral, while we might do well to flavour our well-meaning pacifism with a dose of Machiavellian Realpolitik. We might develop in the direction of State organization and dominance: she might imitate our liberty and individualism.

It will be seen that what we are facing is the primitive and everlasting problem of the relation of Might and Right—a problem which has haunted mankind throughout its history, and forces itself upon our generation with peculiar intensity.

Is Might Right? Have they any vital relation one to the other? How far does that connection extend? There is abundant evidence that these old unstifled questions are agitating the public mind. An ex-Prime Minister thus states the case: 'Unless we achieve victory for the great cause for which we entered the war, the new world will simply be the old world with the heart out of it. The old world believed in ideals; it believed that justice and liberty, truth and righteousness, must triumph in the end: that is, however you interpret the phrase, the old world believed in God, and it staked its existence on that belief. But if wrong emerged triumphant out of this conflict, the new world would feel in its soul that brute force and cunning alone counted in the government of men, and the hopelessness of the dark ages would once more fall on the earth like a cloud.' A philosopher or theologian might state the issue with nicer precision, but it cannot be disputed that the passage quoted above voices the convictions of the plain man. Germany is wrong. If she is victorious, the wrong succeeds. If in this world-wide conflict evil is triumphant, faith in God becomes absurd or impossible. In England the doctrine that Might is Right is regarded as a damnable heresy, and has only emerged in an occasional aphorism of Carlyle or a few cynical or masterful minds. In Germany the doctrine has been openly proclaimed by her greatest philosophers and historians, and has formed the basis of national political orthodoxy.

If Germany wins, a brute philosophy wins. If such be the decree of fate, can Englishmen or any others be expected to adhere to principles that do not pay? Honesty, as Clement VII confessed to Contarini, would be preferable, but honest men get the worst of it.

One trusted leader of British opinion declares: 'Germany must learn that as a matter of business (apart from sentiment and apart from ethics) her system does not pay'.

That is, if Germany is beaten, she will discover that perfidy and frightfulness are not profitable; she will then invest in British-American morality and secure a better dividend! What is this but 'Might is Right' dressed up in a British uniform? In short, when we ask what determines the moral quality of a nation's actions, we are referred to their consequences. Herr Hitler has frequently used this very argument. He insists, in his addresses to the German nation, that the course of the last three years, with its gigantic military and political victories, has proved that Germany has in the Lord of Creation an avowed ally, and that from God's evident approval in the past they may confidently expect His support in the future. Success is the surest touchstone of divine favour.

Before we condemn this doctrine as blasphemous, it may give us pause to recall Cromwell's famous letter to Colonel Hammond: 'My dear friend, let us

look into *Providences*. Surely they mean somewhat. They hang so together, have been so constant, so unclouded.'

Cromwellian preachers did not hesitate to assert the righteousness of the Parliamentary cause on the strength of such demonstrative evidence as Marston Moor and Naseby, and John Goodwin celebrated the violent dissolution of the Long Parliament by the Army in a pamphlet with the significant title, 'Might and Right well met'.

In the judgement of policies and events, success is clearly an impressive criterion, and not in Germany alone!

A good many Englishmen, nominally Christian, confronting for the first time in their lives the dreadful possibility that victory seems uncertain, are unable to suppress the suspicion that we may be paying the penalty of our adherence to Christian scruples. They are beginning to ask if the time has not come to adopt the methods of our enemies which have seemed to serve them so well and so far. Unquestionably we have been more scrupulous than Germany—and therefore God should have noted that we 'played fair', and seen to it that our moral fastidiousness did not go unrewarded. As things are, the wicked have flourished like the bay tree, and popular theism is being confronted with awkward questions. It is indeed hard to resist the glamour of success!

Leaving for a moment the present war, and glancing backward, we find how inveterately the human mind tends to associate prosperity with merit—either as its accompaniment and reward, or as its test and proof. Given the conception of God as powerful and righteous, the triumph of evil is a grave perplexity. Deuteronomic religion reeks with the thought that goodness pays. The Hebrews interpreted their conquest of Palestine as an outstanding instance of virtue rewarded. Either for their own righteousness or (more modestly) for the wickedness of the natives they dispossessed, did Yahweh drive these enemies before them. One wonders what the Hebrew general staff would have done if the Canaanites had inconveniently professed to worship Yahweh; or what the historians would have said if the Hebrew invasion had failed. Even the Book of Job, with its Promethean challenging of an immoral scheme of things, is provided with a reassuring ending more suitable for a Sunday school story. Similarly, the prevalent Messiah doctrine coupled righteousness and victory. A crucified Messiah was the scandal of scandals.

Hastening to modern times we find the trail of Machiavelli everywhere. Richelieu's maxim could be matched a thousand times, 'Les grands desseins et notables entreprises ne se vérifient jamais autrement que par le succès'. In this spirit Mommsen justifies the Roman conquests and the career of Caesar. What are we to think of the following? 'What nature has ordained is maintained of right. The Roman people were ordained by nature for empire. Therefore it was of right that they gained empire by subduing the world. The people which conquered when all were striving for the empire of the world, conquered by the will of God.' This uncompromising assertion that success is the test of worth is not taken from that unholy trinity, Nietzsche, Treitschke and Bernhardi. It is a characteristic passage from the *De Monarchia* of Dante.

The same doctrine is to be found lurking in all sorts of unsuspected quarters—in trial by duel (an appeal to the *Judicium Dei*), in *vox populi, vox Dei* (or the

Divine Right of Majorities), in Bentham's criterion, 'The greatest happiness of the greatest number'. And does not 'Pragmatism' tell us that the belief that works is to be regarded as true. Truth is not a property inherent in an idea—it happens to an idea. Experiments in life are made with 'working hypotheses' which are made 'true' by the event.

What do all these instances imply, except that whatever side won, God was on that side?

The question of the divinity of the event was very interestingly raised in the seventeenth century when William III occupied the throne compulsorily vacated by James II. What right had the Dutch intruder to the English throne? Anglican clergy who had taken the oath to James, had to find some justification for the transfer of their allegiance to the new King. William Sherlock's *Case of Allegiance due to Sovereign Powers* is a good example of their reasoning. The argument is—*de jure*, James was King; *de facto*, William. New forms of government, even if begun by rebellion, are, when once settled, of God's appointment, Who made and governs the world. God not merely permits events, but is the author of them. *De jure* only relates to human laws; *de facto* to divine. It is impossible there should be a wrong king, unless a man make himself king whether God will or no. Did not St. Paul declare 'the powers that be are ordained of God'? There is nothing original in Sherlock's logic; he merely repeats the arguments that had vindicated the position of Cromwell.

We must, then, admit that the doctrine of Might is Right is not exclusively a foreign product, and also that the problem is as complicated as it is urgent.

Professor Ritchie says: 'If individuals and nations are able permanently to influence the world, their conduct is justified by success. To deny this is to deny that God is revealed in history. Success is the test of greatness and goodness.'

Sedgwick, combining induction and theology, puts the same truth in other words: 'If there be a superintending Providence, and if His will be manifested by general laws operating both in the physical and moral world, then must a violation of those laws be a violation of His will and be pregnant with inevitable misery'.

Victor Cousin is equally trenchant: 'L'apologie d'un siècle est dans son existence, car son existence est un arrêt et un jugement de Dieu même, où l'existence n'est qu'une fantasmagorie insignifiante'.

All these are variants of Hegel's fundamental dictum: 'Die Welt-Geschichte ist das Welt-Gericht'.

On the other hand, notable thinkers have repudiated indignantly such an identification of right with success. De Beaulieu adduces the doctrine of the Cross, recalls our Lord's warnings of persecution and reminds Christians that in the world they must expect tribulation.

Renan defiantly insists that honesty is the worst policy: 'En général, dans l'histoire, l'homme est puni de ce qu'il fait de bien, et récompensé de ce qu'il fait de mal. L'histoire est tout le contraire de la vertu récompensée.'

At the Crucifixion Might and Right were dramatically divorced; but Christian faith holds that they were as dramatically reconciled at the Resurrection. Nor must it be forgotten that the Bible ends with the triumphant vindication

of righteousness : 'The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our God and of His Christ, and He shall reign for ever and ever'.

Something deep in man's moral constitution insists that though goodness is doomed to a fight, it must be victorious in the long run. Even the popular preference for 'happy endings' has a profound, though perhaps unconscious, cosmic reference. Evil cannot be allowed to have the last word.

For Right is Right, since God is God
And Right the day must win,
To doubt would be disloyalty
To falter would be sin.

Having been thus brought face to face with the terms of so intractable a problem, we see that four solutions are logically possible :

I. *Might is Might.* Here no moral judgements of any kind are passed on events. The universe is regarded as having no moral meaning whatsoever. A snake in the act of swallowing a live rabbit is doing a perfectly normal thing, and does not meditate on 'nature's holy plan'. Might is neither right nor wrong—it is just might. Power is strictly a-moral, with no other significance. This is the standpoint of naked materialistic fatalism. It is impossibly low—a reversion to primitive animalism. The human soul cannot breathe in such an atmosphere.

II. *Right is Right.* Right may win; it may lose: but victory and defeat, success or failure, are equally irrelevant. Here is the creed for heroes and stoics. A cause is not justified by success any more than it is discredited by failure. *Victrix causa placuit Deis, sed victa Catoni.* In the American Civil War, the victory of the North did not prove that slavery was wrong. Why should slavery be held to be wrong just because its defenders did not prove to be strong? And why should the might of the North prove it to be right? If the South had won the war, slavery would still have been wrong. If slavery is not wrong, nothing is wrong. Cromwell's cause was not demonstrated to be just because his armies were victorious; nor the King's unjust because he was defeated.

Confronting a possibly indifferent universe, austere believers in this creed do not wait until the battle is over in order to see which side was right. Beaten, they would know themselves to be lofty and human, and their conqueror to be low and bestial. Scorning the coarse dignity of power, they hold fast to the dignity of justice. *Right is Right.* Such Promethean integrity is the very contrary of the non-moral neutrality of *Might is Might.* But it is too magnificent—'too pure and good for human nature's daily food'. It could never be anything but the watchword of a moral élite.

III. *Might is Right.* Here fatalism (logically rooted in Pantheism) is strangely based on a conviction of the divine government of the world. The watchwords of this school are Ranke's 'Der beste Prüfstein ist die Zeit'. 'Le vrai, c'est en toutes choses, le fait'. 'Maudire la puissance (j'entends une puissance longue et durable) c'est blasphémer l'humanité' (Cousin). Time tries all. For a cause to fail is the proof that it was mistaken. Success is significant. (Have not orthodox divines held prosperity to be a sign by which, even in its militant phase, the true Church may be known?) God's government is like His character, perfect; everything in history, as in nature, must be in its place, must be

reasonable, and for the greatest good. This world is literally the best of all possible worlds. War is necessary, useful and just. It is nothing else than the combat of truth with error. Great conquerors are the providential agents, and great victories the providential processes by means of which the work of selection goes forward, and senile principles and peoples are eliminated. Whatever is, is best. This school is not disheartened by the difficulty of reconciling their reverence for the old with their recognition of the new! It has a more thorough-going faith in Providence than the orthodox themselves. It out-distances Christian optimism. It accords scientific validity to Browning's flight of faith: 'God's in His heaven, all's right with the world'. The adherents of this creed have grown much more numerous since the idea spread abroad that 'might is right' had a foundation in biological law.

IV. *Right is Might*. This is by far the commonest belief, and remains the conviction of the average Englishman touched by popular Christianity. It is the resultant of faith and hope. The decisive issue is often mysteriously and tantalizingly deferred—'How long, O Lord, how long?'—yet victory is certain at the end of the day. Russell Lowell has given classic utterance to this confidence:

Though the cause of evil prosper
Yet 'tis truth alone is strong;
Though her portion be the scaffold
And upon the throne be wrong—
Yet that scaffold sways the future
And, behind the dim unknown
Standeth God within the shadow
Keeping watch above His own.

Never dreamed though right were worsted, wrong would triumph.

The keystone of this theory is faith in God and righteousness.

If right does not win now, it will win in the future; if not on earth, then in the next world. Such a belief being always short of historical corroboration requires God and eternity to guarantee it. As the Pope said on the death of Richelieu: 'If there is a God, the Cardinal will have to smart for what he has done; but if there is no God, he was certainly an excellent man'.

'In the beginning was the Word', and He is not only Alpha but Omega. Man, a splendid and incorrigible idealist, in default of victory here and now, builds him another world where a good many terrestrial verdicts will be reversed, where Right shall be finally vindicated and enthroned. It is remarkable that the doctrines of *Might is Right* and *Right is Might* are both based upon a conviction of the divine government of the world. One must be (to say the least) very tough-minded to affirm that whatever is, is Right. On the other hand how can one maintain the providential character of history and deny that the general stream of tendency is towards good? Where may men look for the evidence of the hand of God if not in the course of things? Has God left Himself without witness in history? Is it to be written off:

a tale
Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury
Signifying nothing?

The eagerness with which the Right is Might school seize upon examples of

virtue rewarded and evil thwarted, proves at once their anxiety to find support for their theory, and their embarrassment in facing so much in God's world that appears to contradict it. It is only when men are driven back upon the last trench of all that they consent to regard this world merely as a place of education, a sphere for the discipline of character in prospect for the world to come. In this school, as Plato held, men may learn and grow, but the school itself does not change. The difficulty in both positions hinges upon the present unfinished and tangled state of affairs. Even though we are driven to admit that the ideal is far from realized, it is hardly satisfactory to take the short cut and idealize the real. However distressing it may be to our logical sense whose strongest desire is for unity and harmony, we are compelled for the present to tolerate a contradiction in our scheme of thought. What is most human in us refuses to purchase this reconciliation at the price of declaring existing evil to be in accord with the will and goodness of God. We shrink from admitting that the immeasurable horrors and sufferings of the present war are part and parcel of a grand beneficent scheme, in which all these evils are necessary in order that the world may at last proclaim itself to be good. For the sake of logical unity we cannot allow Mephistopheles to have a prescriptive and allotted place in the moral order. Whitewash him as we will, he cannot be reconciled with the holy will of God. Even for those who are not Christian believers, there is still no necessity to de-humanize themselves. Like Antigone they may vow unalterable loyalty to those unwritten and unfailing statutes 'whose life is not of to-day or yesterday, but from all time, and no man knows when they were first put forth'.

The Christian will remember the words of one who in his day had to face mocking and baffling realities: 'We see not yet all things put under Him, but we see Jesus'. Men, whom common consent has named the noblest, have maintained their faith in the teeth of the bitterest trials, the most heart-breaking reverses. It is therefore unlikely that we shall allow events to undermine our conceptions of 'humanity' and 'inhumanity'. Mankind is infallible about human nature. 'There is some one wiser than M. Voltaire,' said Talleyrand, 'c'est tout le monde.' Man *will* not consent to be a creature of nature. He will not deny his humanity. He will keep his faith.

The keeping of his faith means that he cannot wash his hands of the world's travail and take refuge in quietistic detachment. A moral ideal is never seen in its true lineaments unless we strive strenuously toward it, and not merely contemplate it with passive approval. If we feel that a certain thing is right, we ought to fight for it; yes and without previously demanding a guarantee that we are on the winning side. If a thing is worth fighting for, it surely does not lose its value just because we are not sure of getting it. Sacrifice for an ideal enhances its worth and intensifies its reality. Who is to fight for my ideals but myself and those who share them with me? The very recognition that Right is Right, and that Right ought to be Might, should hearten me to strive with might and main that the truth may be vindicated and enthroned. And we have to choose sides *before* the battle. It is not faith, but its counterfeit, that leaves the issue to others—or even to God. To reason that because our cause is good, we need do nothing to further it, but leave it to achieve an automatic supremacy, may look like faith in God, but is in reality moral poltroonery. If men are

willing to fight for what we believe to be an evil cause, *a fortiori* we should fight for a good one. The challenge comes to every generation to make history and to win a world verdict for the right—to be creators not spectators.

Such loyal championship does not mean the exercise of force alone—though it must include that. The issue is not merely decided on the battlefield. Socrates, the Hebrew prophets, played their heroic part by argument, advocacy, passionate witness. The German conscience has been debauched by the sinister sophistries of philosophers, historians and Churchmen. The struggle goes deeper even than arms. It is a war of ideas. It is therefore the privilege and duty of those who cannot bear arms to use every means at their disposal—school, college, press, pulpit—to inspire the national endeavour, to unify the national purpose and to nerve the national will. We cannot pledge the success of our cause. We can do an even better thing—give ourselves without stint to the fight. Only thus shall we deserve to be victorious. We shall have done all men can do to make Right into Might.

The less we depend upon guarantees of success, the more genuine will be our faith—

Better men fared thus before thee,
Fired their ringing shot and passed,
Hotly charged—and sank at last.

Charge once more, then, and be dumb!
Let the victors, when they come,
When the forts of evil fall,
Find thy body by the wall!

F. BROMPTON HARVEY

THE CHRIST, THE KINGDOM AND THE CHURCH

ALTHOUGH the New Testament has been studied for nearly nineteen centuries, its interpretation is not closed, as fresh insights into its meaning reward the competent and reverent scholar. Not that the scholars of to-day make any immodest claim to be superior to their predecessors, but that their resources are superior. Not only do they inherit the results reached by their predecessors, but new discoveries enrich the store of their knowledge, e.g. the contributions of the papyri and the *ostraca* to the understanding of the *Koine*, the language of the New Testament. During the half century in which I have been myself engaged in this study, many conjectures and theories have come and gone; and yet one cannot regard these as ephemeral appearances, for most of them have left some deposit of permanent value behind. The studies have often been detached from one another, as the scholar's interest has been absorbed in one subject, and there has been lacking the synoptic outlook. There has been some truth in the jibe that an expert knows more and more about less and less. As physical science needs both the telescope and the microscope, so there is need in the study of the New Testament to think things together, so that its unity as the literature of the unique revelation of God may be discerned.

2. My interest has been not mainly linguistic, textual or historical, but theological in the more strict use of the word, as the interpretation of the content of that revelation, although the minute studies are a necessary auxiliary to the more comprehensive. On the basis of such studies as I have made, there are three questions of present interest indicated in my title, with which I propose to deal in their organic relation to one another. There are secrets of the inner life of Jesus which the New Testament has not disclosed, although my conviction is that we can gain a further insight than many scholars assume, and the endeavour to gain such insights has been one of the most enduring and, I at least believe, rewarding purposes in all my studies.

I

1. We cannot answer the initial questions: When did Jesus reach His consciousness of His Messiahship and of His Sonship? Were the conceptions parallel, or was the one dependent on the other: Sonship on Messiahship or Messiahship on Sonship? I venture this conjecture not as a rash guess, but as an inference from what His ministry discloses, that for Him Sonship was His essential nature, and Messiahship His historical vocation, not contingent on the wills of men, but necessary in the Will of God. Even if His consciousness of both came in the silent years in Nazareth, His entry on the exercise of that nature in the fulfilment of that vocation had its divine signal, that 'the fullness of the time' was come (Gal. iv. 4) in the Baptist's ministry as His forerunner.

2. It is not improbable that at His own baptism, a fulfilment of righteousness (Matt. iii. 15) as a self-dedication to His task, He by the mediation of the Spirit, a mediation which in His relation to God He confessed, became aware, not only of the divine approval, but of the divine equipment for the discharge of the ministry, to which He was giving Himself. It is consistent with the complete humanity of the Incarnate Word or Son that such miraculous powers as He exercised should come to Him by that mediation, as did the *charismata* to the Church at Pentecost. He was at all points made like unto His brethren (Heb. ii. 11). This consciousness of equipment as the Son of God was the occasion of the Temptation in the Wilderness, the record of which it seems to me impossible to understand literally, and which yields its fullest meaning as a symbolic account of an inner experience given by Jesus Himself to His disciples at or after the confession at Caesarea Philippi to teach them that the kind of Messiahship they were desiring He had rejected as a temptation. The absence of any detailed account in Mark confirms the view that the passage belongs to the teaching. Knowing what were the popular expectations of the Messiah, it is not improbable that He was able to anticipate in the wilderness, where He again by the impulse of the Spirit (Mark i. 12) sought solitude in prayer and meditation, to discover the divine guidance as to the use of His fresh endowments, and yet it may also be that He telescoped, if the use of such a metaphor may be forgiven, into one record later experiences and the initial experience, since the records afford parallels.

3. These records of the ministry give convincing evidence that He did not think of the Messiahship as a restoration of the Davidic type of kingship, but as a realization of the ideal of the Righteous Servant, who would save by suffering, of Deutero-Isaiah. He was not called of God to bring prosperity,

security and dominion to the nation as King (that is the meaning of the symbolic record of the Temptation) but to draw the nation from its vain dreams and false hopes of such an earthly good by repentance and faith to the heavenly treasure of being God's missionary to the nations, and if need be His martyr. However individualized in accordance with its poetic character the description in Isaiah liii may be, its original reference was to the nation purified for such service and sacrifice, and I believe that Jesus entered on His ministry, not anticipating to be solitary in His service and sacrifice, but purposing to lead the nation to fulfil its vocation with Him as the pioneer and perfecter of faith (Heb. xii. 2). If it be recalled that the Son of Man in the Apocalypse of Daniel is also a collective and not individual term, symbol of the reign of the saints, Jesus' use of the title must not be individualized at the beginning of His ministry, although when He made the declaration that the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve and to give His life a ransom for many (Matt. xx. 28) that limitation may be accepted, it being noted, however, that even in this He offers Himself as an example to His disciples. His death was a ransom of many from false aims and hopes. The eschatological aspect, as presented in Enoch, lay in the future.

4. He learned obedience and was made perfect by His suffering (Heb. ii. 10, v. 8). Experience was His painful teacher. We can trace the steps by which He was led to recognize that He must fulfil His vocation alone. In the Sermon on the Mount He addresses Himself to the multitudes. (There was a Sermon on the Mount, although Matthew's record (v-vii) is a compilation of teaching at various times, as the parallels in Luke show.) He expected a wider response than He gained. In the Parable of the Sower (xiii. 1-10) He offers an estimate of the results of this appeal, several kinds of unfruitful, only a little good soil, and He therefore concentrates His training on the twelve as good soil. He does not speak plainly to the people as He had done, but in parables; for them the Kingdom must still remain a mystery, although in His words and works it is already a present reality. 'The Kingdom of God is in the midst of you' (Luke xvii. 21, R.V. marg.). From His disciples He still expects understanding and acceptance (xiii. 10-17). If at Caesarea Philippi Peter was warranted to speak for them, they had been convinced of His Messiahship: but Peter's remonstrance and Jesus' rebuke show that their thoughts were not as His, nor their ways as His (Matt. xvi. 13-24), but still He called them to share His sacrifice. Their subsequent behaviour showed that up to His death they remained unconvinced (xviii. 1) and estranged, He alone was the Righteous Servant and the Son of Man; but, save for one, their faith and loyalty remained, and as the believing and obedient Remnant they held the hope of the future. Jesus anticipated and proclaimed His Resurrection and Second Advent in power and glory (the eschatological aspects of the Messiahship). It was the faith in His Resurrection and the hope of His Second Advent that restored the Remnant to witness to Him.

5. I have in a previous article in this quarterly more fully expounded the crucial significance of the Resurrection and Pentecost. The Resurrection was the consummation of the Incarnation, and gave it permanence and universality. Jesus did not then become Messiah, Son or Word of God, and Son of Man, but He was then 'installed as Son of God with power' (Rom. i. 4, Moffatt). The

experience of that power was mediated to the believer as God's power had been indeed, mediated to Him at His Baptism by the Spirit at Pentecost, where filled with real human trial and focus, the Holy Spirit a fuller life, a holy enthusiasm and energy possessed them to give them certainty, confidence and courage as witnesses to His Lordship, the highest title they could give Him. He ceased not to be Son of Man, since in the Risen Lord the fullness of the Godhead dwelt *bodily* (Col. ii. 9). If the closing words of the First Gospel are not the *ipsissima verba* of the Risen Lord Himself (xxviii. 18, 19, 20) they witness to the experience of the primitive community, and the Pauline and Johannine writings interpret that experience as its light of truth and warmth of grace were focussed in the highest type of personality. The expectants of the imminent Second Advent were disappointed, and we may well ask, Was not this hope a remainder of Jewish literalism? Had Christ not come as Risen Lord in His Spirit? Had not the shadows of this Apocalyptic imagery passed into the substance of divine reality as the fulfilment of all His promises and all the hopes of believers in this His Second Advent?

II

1. If in the humiliation of the Incarnate Word in the earthly life the Kingdom was already present (Luke xvii. 21) surely in the exaltation of the Risen Lord it became still more manifest and potent. In view of conflicting conceptions of the Kingdom we must try to define the term accurately. Our word kingdom suggests the sphere within which the King exercises his kingship, but the Greek term, as used in the Gospels, primarily indicates the active exercise (*the rule*) and not the sphere (*the realm*), although the first would be an abstraction without the second. The Kingdom of God is first of all the Sovereignty of God, that is His sole and supreme activity, for the metaphor in the Gospels suggests not a constitutional modern monarch in his limited function, but a king who is commander in war, judge in peace. God's sovereignty is exercised in nature and history as Creator, Preserver, Judge; but the reference in the Gospels is primarily to His saving grace, as disclosed in the ministry of Jesus Himself.

2. Whether from His consciousness of Messiahship or from His endowment with power at His Baptism, Jesus recognized that the Kingdom had come in Him, or found in the results of His ministry in healing and teaching the signs of its coming, even if still as a mystery not yet fully disclosed we cannot confidently affirm. What is certain is that He anticipated its complete manifestation in power and glory with His Second Advent. In His own thought as well as in the faith of the Church after His Resurrection He moved to the central position by God's appointment. I cannot accept the view that in His ministry on earth He thought of Himself only as herald, not as the Messiah Himself. His predictions are clothed in the poetical symbolic language of Apocalypse, but bringing to the interpretation of His mind here His general teaching we may conjecture that He did not necessarily share the literalism of the primitive community: and if in the perspective characteristic of prophecy even for Him the interval between His Resurrection and His Second Advent, as presented in this Apocalyptic imagery, was foreshortened, yet He confesses ignorance of the day and the hour (Mark xiii. 39). Whatever view our conception of God may lead us to in regard to foreknowledge it is certain that He did not claim to share it;

been indeed, such foreknowledge would have annulled the necessary limitations of real humanity, and have raised Him above the possibility of doubt and fear, trial and temptation, the human experiences in and through which character is formed. The Kingdom thus comes to be even in His own anticipation focussed in Himself, and so it came to be for the Church in His Lordship as a mediatorial sovereignty.

3. This concentration of the Kingdom of God in Jesus Christ as Lord serves to correct several current misrepresentations. (a) The Kingdom is not mainly an ideal of human society to be realized by human effort with some assistance from God: to judge from what is sometimes said or written, man is regarded as the 'predominant partner'. It is God's doing for man's salvation, social as well as individual, not only in man, but also *by* man, as will be shown in dealing with the Church, but God is sovereign even if He uses men to fulfil His purpose. (b) The Kingdom is not universally present in all excellent and valuable human endeavours, such as sanitation schemes, malnutrition relief, artistic or literary achievements, political reforms, but only when and as in Christ men are saved from sin, redeemed and reconciled to God. He must not so generalize the New Testament conception of the Kingdom as to empty it of its content, distinctive of the Gospel of Christ as the power and the wisdom of God unto salvation to every one that believeth (1 Cor. i. 24). There is a universal presence, purpose and activity of God (omnipresent, omnipotent, omniscient). He is in all and through all and over all, of Him and in Him and unto Him are all things, in Him we live and move and have our being, from Him as the Father of lights in whom there is no variation, nor shadow that is cast by turning, comes every good and perfect gift (Jas. i. 17): the recognition of this universal revelation of God in nature and history must not, however, be allowed to depreciate and depotentiate the special revelation in Christ to bring man back to God, the import of the New Testament use of the term Kingdom of God. (c) The Kingdom is present, by faith we receive it (as rule) and enter into it (as realm) in present experience, character and influence: but it is in and not of this world; it is as is God, transcendent of, while immanent in, the world, and only by spiritual discernment can its presence be perceived (John iii. 3). There is progress in the realization of the Kingdom here and now, not inevitable nor uniform, but advanced or retarded, as men see, receive it, or enter into it; and we may dare to hope that there will be a gracious consummation when God's purpose in reconciling the world in Christ is fulfilled. But the conditions and limitations of man's life on earth in space and time forbid the expectation that the perfection of the Kingdom will be reached in this world and age. Its glory and blessedness can be, and will be, experienced only beyond the shadows of our mortality; as is its source so is its destiny in eternal reality. The saints in heaven will not be recalled to earth to share it: but all who become its subjects must pass beyond the veil. This is not other worldliness, but simply a recognition of the larger reality, of which this life is a passing phase and in which the fuller life can be experienced. Life here and now is at its best when men live, not only as seeing Him who is invisible, but also under the power of the age to come (Heb. xi. 27; vi. 5, R.V.). The faith that gives the victory over this world and in death, is 'the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen' (xi. 1). I am modern enough to believe in, and preach, the Social Gospel,

the universal revelation and the progress of mankind, but not so modern as to obscure or to abandon the New Testament conception of the Kingdom of God as the unique sovereignty of God in Christ to save the whole manhood of mankind not in time alone but for eternity.

4. This concentration of the Kingdom of God in Christ has two further consequences. It repels the reproach that is sometimes brought against the writers of the New Testament that they neglect the conception of the Kingdom which has so prominent a place in the teaching of Jesus, and substitute for it the conception of the Church, and it rebukes the depreciation of the Church only too common even among Christians as but the means of the Kingdom as the end. Against Paul especially is this kind of criticism directed. The Epistle to the Romans or to the Ephesians is compared unfavourably with the Sermon on the Mount or the Parable of the Prodigal Son. It is forgotten that neither of these is the whole Gospel, for neither of them gives to Jesus as the Christ the central position which, as has been shown, He assigned to Himself, and the Church confessed in its faith. Paul shared with the primitive community as object of his faith and guide of his thought the Resurrection and Pentecost, the exaltation of Christ as Lord, and the impartation of the new and fuller life to believers in the Spirit. Thus Christ as Risen Lord imparting to the believers so divine a gift became so completely for Him the sole Mediator of God that in the contemplation of, and communion with, Him He and He alone was the Kingdom. So to exalt Christ is not to do disrespect to His teaching or to substitute an inferior object of faith, it is to exalt Him over all.

5. Further, an idea or ideal has most potency when embodied in a person, 'a local habitation and a name'. To use an illustration of the highest by what is incomparably lower, is not the war effort of the nations being thus embodied Roosevelt in the United States, Churchill in Great Britain, and Stalin in Russia? The conception of the Kingdom of God, rooted in the Old Testament and drawing life from its hopes, having little significance for the subjects of Rome, and being depreciated in significance as monarchies give place to republics has less universal and permanent appeal than has the human and divine personality of Jesus Christ our Lord. The New Testament has ample warrant for making Christ's the name above every other name, for in His Saviourhood and Lordship God as Father is glorified (Phil. ii. 9-11). In the measure in which the Church is the community of the Holy Spirit as its common possession, the body of Christ and the temple of God, it is not to be depreciated in comparison with the Kingdom as only a means to the end. Even if it be a means, and not to be wholly identified with the Kingdom, it is a means which is intrinsic and not extrinsic to the end, not accidental but essential, even as moral goodness may be a means of the Supreme Good, but is also necessarily an element in it as well as a factor of its realization. We are thus led from our discussion of Christ and the Kingdom to the treatment of the Church as the New Testament records and interpretation.

III

1. If we identify the Church with the diverse and imperfect human organizations (papal, patriarchal, episcopal, presbyteral, congregational) there may appear some justification for depreciation of them, and of the Church, if we

as to identify Church and Churches. It is convenient to adopt a distinction which has become current in Germany, the Church has two aspects, the divine and the human, even as the Incarnate Word or Son has, and as such it may be described as the continuation of the Incarnation. The divine may be described as the *soteriological*. God makes and uses the Church in the exercise of His sovereign grace for the saving of men. As such it is both the *object* of the Kingdom and its *organ*, for God uses saved men in saving. To repeat a familiar saying, God alone saves, and He does not save alone. Men form effective action associations for co-operation; they adopt means or methods of action in institutions; they entrust different functions to the members, and invest some of their members with authority to direct and control: in short they form an organization. This can be described as the *sociological* aspect, without which the *soteriological* would remain unexpressed and unapplied in this world of time and space. Soon after the inspiration of Pentecost, an organization was formed in the election of the Seven, charged with the distribution of the common food of the community (Acts vi. 1-6). God gave apostles, prophets, evangelists, teachers, the ministry of the Word: the apostles appointed elders or bishops and deacons in the local congregations.

2. The Church as *soteriological*, the community of the Spirit, was and is no abstract ideal; it is a concrete reality, for if God be Spirit, there is nothing more real than the unity of all believers in their common faith in Christ and fellowship with one another in the Spirit. It is the love of God in the grace of Christ that is experienced in the common possession of the Spirit by all believers (2 Cor. xiii. 12); they are one community, a unity because of what they hold in common from God, as real as is the unity of Father, Son and Holy Spirit. This is not an ideal to be realized by men, but a reality created in men by God. In oecumenical gatherings where the external differences in creed, worship, polity divide, the sense of this unity is more deeply felt than are the divisions. The local congregation in apostolic times, while *sociologically* it might appear as a part of a whole made up of parts, was felt to be a *Church* because the Church was present, manifest and active in it, the whole in the part. As regards these two aspects, the divine inspiration and the human organization, two axioms must be laid down: there must be as close a correspondence in quality of the one with the other, so that the divine purpose shall be as consistently and effectively maintained and realized in the human effort as the conditions and limitations of men allow. That need not involve, however, a permanent or universal uniformity of organization. As an organism survives only by adaptation to the environments, so a society must be affected by, and responsive to, local varieties and temporal variations. Scholars are agreed that no uniformity was imposed, but adaptation allowed in the Apostolic Church.

3. If it is, as it is, the Kingdom of God, His sovereignty as exercised in the Saviourhood and Lordship of Christ that creates the Church as its object and organ, saving and using saved men for saving then the Church in this its *soteriological* aspect is to the Kingdom of God as is the *realm* to the *rule*, as is the sphere to the *exercise* of His Kingship. Sinful and erring, weak and unworthy as the human organization, the divided Churches in comparison with the inspiration, the one Church, yet God condescends to use them; He may chastise them with His judgements, but He also restores them in His mercy, for periods of

declension have been followed by eras of revival. It is to the *sociological* aspect of the Church that the description of it as the body of Christ more appropriately applies than to the *soteriological*, for the body is manifest and active in time and space in this world of sense. It is in the human witness and work that Christ finds His mouth to speak, His hands to help and heal, His feet to seek the lost; but also surely in the inner life of its members His mind to know, His heart to feel, and His will to bless. Should the earthen vessel be despised and denied which holds such a (heavenly) treasure? (2 Cor. iv. 7). In the *sociological* aspects the divided Churches, the Church as an empirical entity cannot be identified with the Kingdom; members of the Kingdom are outside its membership, and some are in it who are not in the Kingdom; there are activities of the Kingdom outside of its borders, and sin may be active within it, but in its *soteriological* aspect it is the *Kingdom of God*, the realm in which God rules in Christ by the Spirit, to save and bless.

4. What seems a decisive argument for some who depreciate the Church in comparison with the Kingdom are the facts that Jesus was always speaking about the Kingdom and not the Church, that He expressed no intention to found the Church and that the two passages in which the Church is mentioned present difficulties (Matt. xvi. 18; xviii. 7). Three considerations may be offered to meet this contention. *First* Jesus did call disciples to be His constant companions; they formed a company around Him, and He in the later part of His ministry gave much attention to their training so that they might continue His work. *Second* there was a reason for not using the term Church. The Greek term *ekklesia* was applied to the people of Israel as God's chosen. Until they had definitely sold their birthright for a mess of pottage, their vocation as God's Righteous Servant or Son of Man for their national ambitions, the blessing could not be taken from them; the Remnant could not claim the inheritance as did the company of believers after the Resurrection and Pentecost. For the above reason, *lastly*, I do not regard the two passages about the Church in Matthew as authentic utterances of Jesus, they have no parallels in other Gospels, and Matthew did have an ecclesiastic interest, as other passages show. The Kingdom of which Jesus speaks was continued in Christ's Lordship as rule, and in the Church as realm, and will be till its temporal earthly consummation passes into the eternal heavenly. 'While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal' (2 Cor. iv. 18).

A. E. GARVIE

JESUS AND THE SWORD

IT is easily understandable at times like the present, when good people are so deeply outraged in their moral sensibilities and most folk feel themselves perforce enlisted in the cause of avenging justice, that they should be eager to quote the best of all men in support of that cause; to have some warrant outside of and superior to themselves for their conviction that in serving that cause they serve the highest cause of all. Christians might, in one sense, feel flattered at the way in which men and women who at other times make no

spect pronounced Christian profession turn at times like these to the words of Jesus, and quote Him with something of a true Christian's conviction that in quoting and Him they quote the highest of all authorities. But it is not always realized, either by the lovers or admirers of our Lord, that they should quote Him when lost; they do so with exactitude. No one was ever more discriminating in the use of words than He, and it follows that no one is so liable to misrepresentation by seemingly unimportant verbal differences between Himself and His reporters. It is greatly to be wondered whether the multitude who quote Him now as once having declared of those who take the sword that they shall 'perish by the sword' have any realization how far they are, either from repeating what He said or from understanding what it was that He intended to express. As to His words, both our Authorized and Revised Versions quote Him as having declared to Peter in the Garden of the Arrest: 'All they that take the sword shall perish *with* the sword' (Matt. xxvi. 52). As to what He meant by that pungent and pregnant phrase, nothing but the most exact adherence to His words will permit us to understand.

The difference between 'by' and 'with' is sometimes so slight as to be negligible; to say that I eat my dinner with a fork can have only one meaning: that I eat my dinner by its means, as an instrument. To say of any one that he is to die with a sword could very well mean that he is to perish by its means, as an instrument. But to suppose that it *must* mean this is to open the door to confusion. It is true, if a reckoning of instances be resorted to, that Luke reports a question asked by the disciples in the Garden, as they saw Jesus about to suffer arrest, in which the Greek construction that lies behind our present problem-phrase is translated by 'with' in the sense of 'by means of'—'Lord, shall we smite with the sword?' (Luke xxii. 49). But this is an instance in which, in the struggle with words, the mere science of words is of little use to us. By study of the words we are left without any sure index to their meaning, and barren we remain until we study them in the light of knowledge of another sort.

In this particular instance it is our knowledge of history that makes it possible for us to decide—to say that whilst, speaking etymologically, Jesus might very well have meant that all they who take the sword shall perish by its agency, it is impossible actually to suppose that He said any such thing. For—it is as well, perhaps, to make a blunt and downright statement of it first of all, and to elaborate it afterwards—if He had said that, history would have proved Him long ago to have been a liar, or at the very best to have uttered a perfectly valueless opinion. It would be impossible to find a lover of our Lord, difficult to discover even an admirer of His, willing to believe either of those things about Him. All would be prompted to say of Jesus, lying under such a charge, what Paul once said about God: 'Let Him be found true, and every man a liar'. But this means—and our obligation is quite unavoidable—that we must refuse to acknowledge as His any statement which history compels us to regard as false; and that history does contradict the saying: 'All they that take the sword shall perish *by* the sword' is so plain, that it is difficult to understand how it is that so many folk have been willing to believe of Jesus that He ever said or suggested it.

The difficulty just here, if difficulty there be, will be found to consist, not in

marshalling evidence but in keeping it within the limits prescribed by a proper economy—the making of a judicious choice amongst instances that crowd into the mind. David is there, the greatest warrior of Jewish history in its Old Testament period, but dying of extreme old age and upon his bed. There is also Alexander of Macedonia, the greatest captain of antiquity, dying—it is true—whilst he was yet young, but from natural causes and upon his bed. Students of modern history will think of Napoleon passing scatheless through so many battles and dying—though in middle-age—as his father did, of cancer of the stomach and on his bed. Foch is there, and Clemenceau, soldier and politician but each devoted to the sword, and each living the full term of his years and dying quietly at last, upon his bed. This is not, of course, a complete list, but it is a representative and significant one. If the sword was to fall in retributive justice upon any, it ought not to have failed in its office upon these. Can we doubt, history having been impartial and consistent in this up to the present, that it will continue to be so? Is it not plain that if Jesus had said of those who take the sword that they shall perish '*by*' it, that history would be found to rebuke Him, proving Him at worst to have uttered a falsehood and at best to have given voice to an utterly valueless opinion? Let us then reject, as of His framing, the false word '*by*', and consider the word the Gospel gives us and seek light upon the actual saying of our Lord: 'All they that take the sword shall perish *with* the sword'.

This saying needs to be understood as expressing two judgements, and not merely one. Jesus gave voice here, first to a fundamental judgement regarding the sword: that it perishes; then, but secondarily, there was His judgement upon the users of the sword: that they perish with their instrument. These, particularly in view of so much of man's history in the world, are two fearful pronouncements; but no real sense can be made of this cryptic saying on any other sort of exposition—no sense, that is, of such a quality that it will bear examination *at the bar of history*.

'The sword perishes'—Jesus stood apart from the rest of men when He perceived that; He separated Himself from mankind when He expressed that judgement. Men look at the sword through the mists of their ambition, struggle, frustration, and see it as the symbol of achievement. Often they try other methods first, but in reserve they hold the sword, and when other methods fail they grasp that saying: 'We shall succeed with this'. Jesus looked at the sword and not so much saw it, as saw through it. That of itself should impress us as a singular achievement. He saw it offered to Himself and rejected it, not—so far as He ever expressed Himself—on moral so much as on utilitarian grounds; for He saw it as a symbol of impermanence, a type of the things that pass away. Others before Him had sung the day when the sword should be displaced from its supremacy. In Isaiah the end of its long day had been promised (Isa. ii. 2-4; ix. 2-7); in the Psalms its power had been mocked (Ps. xxxiii. 16-17; xlvi). But not until Jesus thus spoke was the sword proclaimed in its true nature, the essential deceitfulness of it exposed and proclaimed. 'The sword perishes'—terrible judgement, if it be true; 'a symbol of the things that pass away'—how does that insight look, when scrutinized in the light of history?

David's kingdom, fruit of a life given over to the sword, outlived its creator

only by
disunity
effectua
day, sc
strife, t
selves :
who br
see his
anarchi
wrought
its acco
destroy
sword
ments,
manen
the sw
is roon
it was
perish
estima

The
impair
other
instru
in the
and r
achiev
proves
in all
It wou
a purp
the se
had n
taken
the sv
sentim
shall b
no les
so pur
revise
reflec
conce
just a
poign

No
as we
has n
other

only by part of the length of the life of his son ; collapsing first upon itself in civil disunity, it yielded piecemeal to outward attack : what the sword had done was effectually undone by the sword. Alexander's conquests, monumental in his day, scarcely survived his own decease ; were rent asunder first by internecine strife, the remains soon compelled to acknowledge a power greater than themselves : what the sword had wrought the sword impartially destroyed. Napoleon, who brought all Europe through the sword into suzerainty to France, lived to see his own especial instrument undo that work and Europe made into an anarchy again. And Foch and Clemenceau, how has their achievement, wrought by means of the sword, fared in the slender years that have followed its accomplishment ? The Germany they humbled, whose military power they destroyed, is once again the terror of Europe and nightmare of the world : the sword is proved venal once again, undoing another of its great accomplishments, and that seemingly the greatest of them all. 'Achievement' or 'Impermanence' ? Who can doubt which is correct ? Jesus, as we might expect, saw the sword for what it is, and there is little ground for surprise in that ; but there is room for wonder that the rest of us should so consistently fail to do so. Once it was said, and is listened to, it must be perceived as the truth : 'The sword perishes'. If Jesus *were* listened to, the sword would stand no less in public estimation than it did in His own as the sign-manual of the things that perish.

The verdict of history upon the sword amounting, then, to a strict and impartial confirmation of the insight of Jesus, what has it to say regarding His other pronouncement : that they who take the sword will perish with their instrument ? In what sense, if any, can that be said to be true ? Only, we find, in the most tragic and poignant sense of all ; only in the sense that most grieves and most rebukes us. For a man is identified, in this world, with his achievement : let him give himself for an object which, being realized, proves to lack the gift of permanence, and we must be prepared to say of him in all seriousness, so far at least as this world is concerned, that he 'perishes'. It would be hard to imagine a heavier or more pathetic judgement passed upon a purposeful man than that : that his life's work had proved to hold within itself the seeds of its own decay : that it had been as well, in fact, if that man had never been born. Such judgements upon our 'heroes'—and it may be taken for a sign and measure of our confusion that it is so often from amongst the sword-men of an era that its heroes are called—require a freedom from sentimentality which Jesus certainly compassed within Himself, but which we shall find it very hard to achieve. They appear, however, to be required of us no less by the hard facts of everyday life than by the judgement which Jesus so pungently expressed. Could we, for instance, imagine Foch or Clemenceau revisiting the earth at the present juncture, must we not suppose that their reflections would assume this sombre and tragic tone : that, so far at least as concerns their chief purpose and accomplishment in this world, they might just as well never have been born ? And this, surely, is to 'perish' in the most poignant and tragic sense of the word ?

Nothing could exceed the niceness and discrimination of the Divine justice as we see it recorded and perpetuated in history on this solitary issue. For it has not infrequently happened that a servant of the sword has served his age in other ways as well, and it is observable that whilst his sword-work perishes and

he himself, in the sense that we have discussed, perishes with it, his other work may have proved to be exempt from that mortality and he himself to live on in virtue of that work. David comes to mind, a vivid and convincing instance here. He was not only soldier but poet, and whilst the fruit of his conquests soon collapsed his song lives on, and he lives on in his singing. If we identify as his no more than the deathless '*Lament for Saul and Jonathan*' (2 Sam. i. 19-27) we hold him still by that solitary token; nor can we seriously doubt that if it were given to him to return he would be glad to find that one pure song immortal, whilst all the painful gains of his warfare had dissolved with the dust. Well might he wish, though vainly now, that all his time had been devoted to a labour that has been proved imperishable.

Is it possible that we are offered, in this discrimination, a means of resolving the problem which presses upon us most urgently in this connection? Talk of David and Alexander, of Napoleon and even of Foch and Clemenceau, is all very well; it touches us, if it touches us at all, only at a remove; we can be philosophers easily enough about them all. But most of us who are adult folk in these days have either ourselves borne arms, or are bound in ties of blood or friendship or of Christ to those who bear them now in our behalf. It is not only hard for us to agree that either we or they are guilty of *wrongdoing* in this service of our age; we stand coldly also to the suggestion that in such a form of service either we or they are *wasting our time*. Very well then: whilst it is difficult to see how Jesus' repudiation of the sword, whether for His own defence or in the service of His cause, can ever be any other than a judgement upon our acceptance and use of it—it may still be true of us and of those whom we cherish in the world, that though as fighting men we be proved eventually to have spent our force for naught, we shall not for that reason suppose either them or ourselves to have totally failed. Of none of us can it be said that we are *merely* fighting men. We are fathers of families, makers of laws, cultivators of the land, writers of books, we have the spirit of poetry; here, in these things, we have lasting worth in the world as doers of lasting work; in so far as we are vitally identified with such things, we abide. But let us hold the distinction clear and close: in so far as men, of whatever morality or of whatever religion, rely for their achievement upon the organization and use of violence, just so far must we expect it to be proved that they have engaged in a mere *temporality*—to have been doing something which, by its very nature, will demand to be done over and over again. We may feel ourselves to be so situated as to have no option to the use of the sword, but we should apprehend that when all the sword-work is finished and we have defended ourselves again and justified our cause once more, if any quality of *permanence* is to attach to this work it will still have to be imparted to it. That will wait still for our practice of justice, and pity, and fraternity—virtues which, if we had exercised them sooner might well have made the use of the sword unnecessary; virtues in the service of which the sword has ever proved, at best a mere temporary expedient, and at worst a fickle and traitorous support.

For, if we have already said that He was offered the sword and declined it, we begin now to see what were the grounds of His refusal. Fundamentally, it was just that He was made in all things like unto His brethren. Like us, He had a work to do; like us, He had one earthly life in which to do it; and

precisely as with us the sword, if He had consented to use it, would have introduced into His work the element of decay. 'Once and for all'—thus might we express the nature of His opportunity: once, for all men; once, for all time. How fixed was His resolve not to admit to His life's work any element of impermanence. His resolution against the sword, so far as He expressed Himself, appears to have been taken and maintained on that strict utilitarian ground alone. We have said that He was separated from us in the insight He expressed in this profound saying. It remains to be said that in seeing and saying and acting thus He was pursuing 'us men and our salvation'—doing it once before men that men might do it after Him, for His sake and by His grace. He matched action so strictly with insight because only thus could He hope to bring many sons to glory. And we, perhaps, when through His fellowship we share more of His sense of the importance of all that we do, shall be brought to share His inexpugnable reluctance towards that instrument which, more than any other, introduces into the work of those who 'take' it the elements of death and decay.

REGINALD GLANVILLE

HISTORY WITH THE BEST LEFT OUT

SOMETHING happened yesterday and something has happened to-day which we say is making history. Yet what we think to be all important may be ephemeral and not of the deep and abiding centre within the structure of the universe. There are many theories of history since St. Augustine's, which held the field for a thousand years, offering to explain the pattern of society at a given moment; but there is one broad distinction between the schools which concerns us—the writing of sacred and the writing of secular history. We cannot say anything is secular and nothing more, but one scholar professes to concern himself with 'things as they are', the other with moments and movements not so apparent. It is not always realized that what the religious historian and the theologian mean by history is not 1066 and all that. Indeed, the sacred historian's selection of events and the plane on to which they are lifted, result in a kind of literature so different from the recognized historian's writings that there is real justification for the suggestion that theologians and others should use a less ambiguous term than history.

There is, naturally enough, a revival of history reading by the general public. Some have taken down their Gibbon's and having cut the pages and smelled the paper knife put it back on the shelf with a sigh, wishing they had read it in their youth. Others, the writer among them, have been steadily ploughing through the lucid pages of Fisher's *History of Europe*—a best-seller, by the way. In reading, some of us have not always found history as written by these writers a cordial for our drooping spirits; in truth the exercise has had a sobering effect on the mind resulting in a distinct feeling of depression. Those who only know one kind of historian need the discipline of making a distinction between secular and sacred. Sacred history includes the kings of Israel and the Apostles not as characters changing the destinies of mankind, of their own volition and for their own ends, but rather as instruments furthering the purposes of God.

The sacred historian, it should be pointed out, is often concerned with individuals, who for their contemporaries were not in the news and episodes not requiring head-lines. There would be few, probably, to give Abraham god-speed when he set off from Ur of the Chaldees to discover the city that hath the foundations. When the fish was served in the Imperial palace, table talk would not centre around Peter and Andrew, who may have caught them, indeed their names were quite unknown. Marcus Aurelius descending the steps of the palace, still brooding upon that city on high, as Pater reminds us, held his nose away from the rabble. Celsus at the end of the second century gets a good deal of cynical amusement from the lowly things of this earth. He writes of the 'workers in wool and leather, laundry-men and persons of the most uneducated and rustic character, who would not venture to utter a word in the presence of their elders or of their wiser masters'. Yet it is not many of the mighty and noble but foolish things who have been caught up in the great sweep of God's purpose for the world and man.

We may catch the tone and pitch of the secular historian in a statement made some years ago by Dr. J. B. Bury—'History is a science, no less and no more'. So the subject matter must be insulated, as in a laboratory, from the baleful influence of philosophizing and theology, and studied with scrupulous detachment. Some years later, taking Bury's pronouncement as a text, Professor Hearnshaw, in an article on 'History as a Science' in the popular work, *An Outline of Modern Knowledge*, concludes with the dictum:

History has ceased to concern itself with *a-priori* speculations as to the purpose for which the world and man were created, or as to the inherent metaphysical ideas which the time-process is making explicit, and it has placed itself in line with the other sciences which are endeavouring to explain to the human mind the meaning of things as they are.

There is to be no place for metaphysical abstractions, nothing but 'things as they are'. There are of course historians who would not submit to such limitations, but this purely objective study of events in the time process is representative of a number of popular writers on the subject to-day.

In trying to strike the contrast between sacred and secular history one might begin with what history, considered only as a science, leaves out. One could hardly offer a more striking example than one recently given by Professor John Foster¹ of Selly Oak College. He finds that the Cambridge Modern History gives a volume each to the French Revolution and Napoleon, but not a word to a contemporary movement 'which is the greatest happening since Pentecost'. Within ten years from 1792 five of the great Missionary Societies were founded. Within fifty years all the foremost missionary agencies in the British Isles, of the Protestant Churches on the Continent of Europe and of the United States were in the field, while the missionary zeal of the Roman Catholic Church reached a zeal of unprecedented height. Had there been no Day of Pentecost, the story of Great Britain would have been very different from what it is, and nothing is more certain than when the storming of the Bastille has faded from memory the effect of the missionary impetus of that period will be more potent than ever.

One should also stay to think what is left, after what has been left out. It is a

¹ *Expository Times*, February, 1941.

world without design or plan, society without God and man without a future. The writer had to put Dr. Fisher's great work down more than once because it left a torturing impression on his mind that society was mainly in the hands of tyrants and the pattern of things shaped either by the invention of a new weapon of warfare or sheer chance. Turning to the preface much was explained.

Men wiser and more learned than I have discerned in history a plot, a rhythm, a predetermined pattern. These harmonies are concealed from me. I can only see one emergence following upon another as wave follows wave, only one great fact with respect to which, since as it is unique there can be no generalization, only one safe rule for the historian: that we should recognize in the development of human destinies the play of the contingent and unforeseen.

The effect upon the human spirit when the best has been left out of history may be judged by the words of Bertram Russell. In measured cadences they fall upon the ear like the regular tolling of the passing bell:

Brief and powerless is man's life; on him and all his race the slow sure doom falls pitiless and dark. Blind to good and evil, reckless of destruction, omnipotent matter rolls on its relentless way; for man condemned to-day to lose his dearest, to-morrow himself to pass through the gates of darkness, it remains only to cherish, ere yet the blow falls, the lofty thoughts that enoble his little day. . . .

Such acceptance of things as they are calls forth, says our philosopher, a spirit undismayed by 'the empire of chance' and a defiance of irresistible forces. But this Promethean attitude, says Mr. Christopher Dawson (rightly, we think), can never be adopted by the ordinary man.

How changed becomes the perspective when what has been left out is restored. When we begin to read the Christian interpretation of history we are at once struck by a difference of tone and spirit, of something less aggressively dogmatic but a temper serenely and strongly confident, confident with imputed faith and knowledge. We realize that the sacred historian is eclectic of men and episodes that are an illumination of the earthly scene and an interpretation of its meaning. We thus understand what Mr. H. G. Wood meant when he said that 'it was Christianity which first gave me a sense of unity and purpose in history'. Further, if man cannot, with Bertram Russell, defy omnipotent matter or bear with proud face Promethean torture, he is of larger size and girth because a son of God, bearing the imprint of His likeness, so that the world itself, for one with eternity in his heart, is too small to contain him. Velasquez when painting Spanish kings and princes found it necessary constantly to add large strips to his canvas so as to provide more background: so the scene of man's struggle and endeavour must, in the sacred historian's view, be stretched out into Eternity. History for him can never be contained within any science or philosophy, and theology is too narrow to contain it, so that it must rise to a kind of mystical communion with the glorious company of the apostles, the goodly fellowship of the prophets, the noble army of martyrs, the holy Church throughout all the world.

All this has been said so well by Dr. C. H. Dodd¹ that it may be in place here to give a brief digest of his argument. He writes to the effect that when it is said that for Christianity the eternal God is revealed in history, it does not mean that any striking episode in history may be regarded as the self-revealing act of

¹ *History and the Gospel.* (Nisbet.)

God, such as the re-emergence of the Germans under Adolf Hitler; nor that the truth of God can be discovered by a synthesis of the observed facts of history, as in the 'organic' or the 'cyclic' theory put forward by the philosophy of history. History as a field of the self-revealing activity of God does not consist of bare events, but of a particular series of events to which a unique intensity of meaning belongs. 'The particular, even the unique, is a category entirely appropriate to the understanding of history; and since one particular event exceeds another in significance, there may well be an event which is uniquely significant, and this event may give a character to the whole series to which it belongs.' It is the claim of Christianity that a unique significance attaches to the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, as revealing the purpose of God in history, and that this supreme event gives a unique character to the whole series of events recorded in the Bible from the call of Abraham to the emergence of the Christian Church. But we must say more: 'The meaning of history is determined by that which lies beyond history—the events in which the divine action is recognized are interpreted as interventions of God from His throne on high. The Christian view of history is one which refuses to identify it simply with the time process.'¹ History as continued actions, not a series of events, still less the play of the contingent, but the result of interventions beyond time—this is not history as the plain man understands it but revelation.

Perhaps a footnote may be allowed. The varied theories and interpretations imported into the word history leave one wondering whether it ought to be used in religious discussions. Speaking as a very humble student saddled to brother ass I find myself frequently in danger of being caught by the head, like Absalom, in trying to follow my teachers who persist in using the word history for personages and events of little moment for those concerned with things temporal, though of vast import for what lies beyond the time-series. Why not leave history to the professors who claim it as a word peculiarly their own and speak of 'the mighty acts of God' or simply, in Pauline speech, of 'the purpose of God'?

J. H. BODGENER

ASPECTS OF HOLY COMMUNION

IN the long, unhappy, series of eucharistic controversies, from Berengarius in the eleventh century until modern days, a disproportionate attention has been given to what is really more a philosophical than a religious question. Men have been so sure of the presence of Christ in the Sacrament that they have been intent on explaining the manner of that presence. But, amid the superabundance of theories, there is one thing certain—that the actual experience of Christians is independent of the logic of their explanation. Countless works of devotion and autobiography testify that, in all ages and in all circumstances, the Sacrament has been a vehicle of grace. As to controversial questions, Dr. Lowther Clarke has well said recently:

The difference is narrowed down to one point, whether or not we may suppose a Real Presence in the consecrated Bread and Wine apart from their reception by the

¹ *The Kingdom of God and History*. Church Community and State Series.

communicants. Although this difference may lead to practical consequences which seem important, it is so small in comparison with what unites us that it should not be allowed to cause misunderstanding and division.¹

The emphasis on Holy Communion as a means of grace has not been lacking in the history of our own Church, and it would not be difficult to compile a catena of Methodist divines who, in full agreement with Wesley's Standard Sermon No. XII, would testify to its unique character. Readers of this Review will by now be familiar with Dr. Vincent Taylor's Fernley Lecture, where he expounds the Sacrament as a channel through which the Christian participates in the blessings of the atoning death of Christ.

To comprehend the full meaning of the ordinance, however, it is necessary to go beyond the private benefit to the believer and consider it as a corporate act of worship, and it would be well to restate for Methodism what was done in its early days when Brevint's *Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice* was our recognized manual. And there are, indeed, points on which Brevint can be amplified. Dr. Rattenbury in his *Vital Elements of Religious Worship* approaches it from the liturgical side, and this is important, for along with the practical identity of our Order with that of the Church of England we inherit her sacramental tradition.

Despite its title, Mr. Gordon James' article on 'The Methodist Doctrine of Holy Communion' in the *London Quarterly* of January, 1940, does not cover the ground. It conclusively vindicates our belief in the 'association, if not the identification, of the bread and wine with the body and blood of our Lord', yet it only alludes in one short paragraph to aspects of the service itself.

That it is the pre-eminent act of Christian worship is an obvious fact of history. For fifteen hundred years its position as the Sunday service was unchallenged, and would still be so, even among Protestants, if Luther, Calvin and Wesley had had their way.

What, then, should be held by Methodists? It is not suggested that all said here must be held by them *de fide*, but one thing must be affirmed. There have been developments and changes of emphasis in Methodist doctrine, but there has been no change such as would warrant the branding as heretical what was previously orthodox. In other words, if it was ever right for a Methodist to believe a certain doctrine, it is still permissible for him to do so now, though this may not allow him to impose that doctrine on others.²

Let us see, therefore, what we can gather from precedent, scriptural and Methodist, as to the elements of the Sacrament as an act of public worship.

We have first those based on 'This do in remembrance of Me' and 'Ye do show forth the Lord's death'. It seems quite obvious to us that the Sacrament is an act of remembrance of our Lord's death, but it is very doubtful if this was the earliest interpretation of the Supper. Whatever the date and circumstances

¹ *The English Liturgy in the Light of the Bible*.

² E.g. Though most present-day Methodists hold the 'validity' of lay administration, yet Mr. Gordon James is not entitled to charge with heresy those who still hold another view. For these latter can point not only to Wesley's views as stated in his sermon 'The Ministerial Office' but also to such a fact as the refusal of the City Road Chapel Trustees, for thirty-five years after Wesley's death, to allow administration there by any one, even a President of the Conference, unless he had been ordained episcopally. Incidentally, correlation of administration with the 'universal priesthood of believers' implies treating it as a priestly sacrifice.

of the *Didache* it does seem to represent a Jewish, pre-Pauline, strain in Christianity, and in the Eucharist there described there is no reference to the death of Christ or to the Last Supper. And this would be quite in accord with the instances of the 'Breaking of Bread' in the early chapters of Acts, which were apparently a continuation of the Fellowship Meals of the disciples during the three years' ministry. And, as a matter of fact, the bread and wine, even the bread broken and the wine outpoured, do not of themselves, without instruction, suggest the body slain and the blood shed.

But, especially under Pauline influence, the Eucharist must speedily have become an incontrovertible witness to the fact of the Sacrifice on Calvary. Even before any gospel was written it was a perpetual reminder to the Church that this greatest event in human history was reality and not myth.

Lift your eyes of faith and look
On the signs He did ordain;
Thus the bread of life was broke,
Thus the Lamb of God was slain. (L.S. 18.)¹

It was also a witness to the Resurrection, because from the very beginning it was celebrated on the first day of the week, not on the Friday, which would have been the natural thing if there had been no Resurrection. Similarly herein lies the importance of the observance of the Christian year, in which we are, in the Communion Service, helped so much by the Collects for each Sunday and the Prefaces for the great Festivals, which we owe to the Roman and Gallican Churches, for they are not known to the Eastern Church.

But, besides being an internal witness to the Church, it is an external witness to the world. It is a Proclamation that Christ still lives, that He is still active in the world. The Church has passed through dark days in her history, days when she has in many ways been false to Christ's teaching, but so long as the Bread and Wine has been lifted up, though it may have been superstitiously, so long has she been guided in one straight path—the declaration of the absolute deity of Christ and of His atoning work. And that witness has not been unfruitful, as we may gather from history, whether it be that of the Muscovite envoys telling of the Divine Liturgy in the Church of St. Sophia—'There in truth, God has His dwelling with men. We can no longer abide in heathenism'—or of Methodism's great lay preacher, William Dawson, receiving the consciousness of the forgiveness of sins as he walked up the aisle of Bramley Parish Church to receive the sacred elements.

Then let us still profess
Our Master's honoured name,
Stand forth His faithful witnesses,
True followers of the Lamb. (L.S. 13.)

And in another sense do we 'show forth the Lord's death'. It is a memorial before God in the sense in which we speak of a memorial to our Conference—a reasoned appeal. We join ourselves not only to what happened in time two thousand years ago but to what is happening outside of time itself. 'The Lamb slain before the foundation of the world' is the 'Lamb before the throne as it were

¹ L.S. refers to *Hymns on the Lord's Supper* by John and Charles Wesley.

slain'. And we have a part in that heavenly intercession—a theme so fully dealt with by Dr. Meechan in a recent issue of this Review.¹

As Brevint reminds us, 'Christ never designed to offer Himself for His people without His people—no more than the high-priests of old,' and further:

The Sacrifice in itself can never be repeated, but nevertheless this Sacrament, by our remembrance, becomes a kind of sacrifice whereby we present before God the Father that precious Oblation of His Son once offered. And thus do we every day offer unto God the meritorious sufferings of our Lord, as the only sure ground whereon God may give, and we obtain, the blessings we pray for. Now there is no ordinance or mystery that is so blessed an instrument to reach this everlasting sacrifice and to set it solemnly before the eyes of God, as the Holy Communion is. To men it is a sacred Table where God's minister is ordered to represent from God his Master the Passion of His dear Son, as still fresh, and still powerful for their eternal salvation. And to God it is an Altar whereon men mystically present to Him the same sacrifice as still bleeding and suing for mercy.

As it is more concisely put by Charles Wesley in words which are but one instance of this emphasis which is his most striking contribution to sacramental thought:

With solemn faith we offer up,
And spread before Thy glorious eyes
That only ground of all our hope,
That precious, bleeding Sacrifice,
Which brings Thy grace on sinners down,
And perfects all our souls in one. (L.S. 125.)

There are difficulties in this for many who say that God is waiting to forgive and bless us and needs no reminder of Calvary, but such difficulties are one with the difficulty raised by any full doctrine of the Atonement. After all, it is only an amplification of the phrase constantly and often heedlessly used in our prayers, 'For the sake of Jesus Christ our Lord'.

'Put me in remembrance; let us plead together; set forth thy cause that thou mayest be justified' are the divine words in Isaiah's prophecy.

I have dealt rather more fully with this aspect both because it is one unfamiliar in Methodism, and because, fully realized, it will give renewed inspiration to our worship.

But there is something deeper, as we are reminded by the warning of the ancient Liturgies—'Holy things for the holy'—and by our Prayer of Oblation, which begins by asking God by the merits and death of Christ to grant remission of our sins and all other benefits of His Passion, but brings us next to our self-dedication when we 'offer and present our souls and bodies to be a reasonable, holy and living sacrifice'. We are here on ground far removed from controversy—the basic ground of Christianity, known to all ages and all types of men.

'If thou desire to honour the sacrifice, offer thy soul for which it was slain.'²

'The best and holiest sacrifice we bring with righteousness, presenting it as an offering.'³

'We take upon ourselves with joy the yoke of obedience and engage ourselves,

¹ July, 1940.

² Chrysostom.

³ Clement of Alexandria.

for love of Thee, to seek and do Thy perfect will. We are no longer our own but Thine.¹

Our souls and bodies we resign;
With joy we render Thee
Our all, no longer ours but Thine,
To all eternity. (L.S. 157.)

And self-dedication also entails the dedication of our possessions. The Liturgy proper begins with our offering to God of His gifts to us. The bringing of gifts in order to meet the necessities of the poorer of the brethren has been from the earliest times an integral part of the service. It was indeed from these gifts that the bread and wine for administration were selected. So it is still done in Milan Cathedral where an early Liturgy, Ambrosian, non-Roman, is used.

To do good and to distribute forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased.² Upon the first day of the week let every one lay by him in store as God has prospered him.³

As Bishop Gore says, 'The early Eucharists must often have resembled a Harvest Festival'. The Service of God is one with the service of man.

This Offering is also evidence of the 'Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving' of which we speak after Communion. It must be confessed that our own service, based as it ultimately is on the Roman Mass, is rather lacking in these elements; and here, if anywhere, it could be enriched by a fuller prayer of thanksgiving between the *Sursum Corda* and the *Ter-sanctus*. The earliest records point to an extempory prayer of this character and the Oriental Liturgies are rich in examples. And we must not forget that the most important liturgical innovation of the Wesleys was the introduction of sacramental hymns; music is the instinctive medium of thanksgiving to God.

We do not know what prayer our Lord offered in the Upper Room, but we do know that it was a prayer of thanksgiving, and we do know that a hymn was sung by the disciples. This must have been the earliest interpretation given to the service by the apostolic Church.

How comprehensively are all these aspects of sacrifice brought out:

Father, our Sacrifice receive,
Our souls and bodies we present,
Our goods and vows and praises give.
Whate'er Thy bounteous love hath lent,
Thou canst not now our gift despise,
Cast on that all-atoning Lamb,
Mixed with that bleeding Sacrifice,
And offered up through Jesu's name. (L.S. 153).

Again, the service is one of Communion with one another in Christ. 'We being many are one bread and one body; for we are all partakers of that one

¹ The Covenant Service. ² Heb. xiii. 16 (Prayer Book Version). ³ 1 Cor. xvi. 2.

bread.' How evident this must have been when the Pax—the Kiss of Peace—was part of the service, and we ought still to realize it, obscured though it may be by such lapses as the individual wafers among Roman and Anglo-Catholics and individual cups among modern Methodists. Here, in the common meal, we see, with Augustine, that 'It is the sacrament of the unity of the Body and Blood of Christ, the very fellowship of saints, where shall be peace and unity, full and perfect'.

Who Thy mysterious Supper share,
Here at Thy table fed,
Many and yet but one we are,
One undivided bread. (L.S. 165.)

But the Communion of Saints is not only with the living. We remember those who 'have departed this life in Thy faith and fear'. 'We are to rejoice in that holy fellowship wherein we have part with the faithful patriarchs and prophets of old; the holy apostles and evangelists; the blessed martyrs and confessors; the redeemed of all ages who have died in the Lord and now live with Him for evermore.'

And not only with them but with the whole company of heaven.

Angels in fixed amazement
Around our altars hover,
With eager gaze
Adore the grace
Of our eternal lover. (L.S. 162.)

It is of course impossible to exhaust the meanings of Holy Communion. Each Eucharist meets us in the midst of new experience. There would be much to say of those great personal or corporate occasions when our Church directs or recommends its observance—Marriage, Ordination, Reception of New Members, Covenant Service and others—which make it a Communion 'with special intention'. And the Coronation Service of this Realm is in fact a service of Holy Communion with special intention of hallowing the Monarch.

But one word must be said of the 'forward look'. Vivid to the early Church, waiting daily for the Second Coming, must have been our Lord's words forecasting the drinking of the wine anew with them in His Father's Kingdom, and new hope must have come to them as they met each week to 'show forth the Lord's death till He come'.

It should still be so with us. No Communion is by itself, it reaches back and reaches forward.

The wine which doth His passion show,
We soon with Him shall drink it new
In yonder dazzling courts above;
Admitted to the heavenly feast,
We shall His choicest blessings taste,
And banquet on His richest love. (L.S. 93.)

No person can, in the space of one Communion, bring adequately to his

¹ Euchologion of the Church of Scotland.

mind all these aspects of such an act of worship. But the Church should provide, in its ritual, for the inclusion of them all. In this respect we have no great reason to be dissatisfied with our present Liturgy, but, if ever the time comes for reconsideration, the revisers should not be so bound down to the English Prayer Book of 1662 as they seem to have been in the past. It has already been indicated how the Eucharistic Prayer might be enriched and, to go a very short way from our own traditions, we can learn from the excellent Common Order of the United Church of Canada, notably in the Prayer of Consecration (based on the Scottish Liturgy and the English of 1549 and 1928), which gives prominence to the memorial offering and to the epiclesis of the Word and Holy Spirit.¹

More important, however, than the verbal exactness of the Liturgy is the desirability of a uniform use throughout Methodism. It would be a more potent cause of unity than many an administrative adjustment.

DUNCAN COOMER

OLD AND NEW IN ST. PAUL

'I SHOULD be glad,' wrote an eminent theologian, Dr. W. Newton Clarke, at the beginning of the present century, 'if some competent Christian scholar would give us a book on "The Old and the New in Paul"'. So far as the present writer knows, the task has never been attempted. Numerous writers have touched on the theme *en passant*, from the eloquent and learned Dr. Clarke himself a generation ago, to the scintillating Mr. Beverley Nichols in our own day. But no one has given us a full length study of the subject, and one purpose of this paper is to express the hope that some one among our scholars will put us all in his debt by supplying this 'felt need'. Pending the advent of an adequate treatment of this important and fascinating subject, the present writer ventures to set down a few reflections by way of informal prolegomena.

I

Of course, the subject is part of a wider one—the distinction between the transient and the abiding in the Bible as a whole, a distinction which perhaps has not yet been clearly made even by the scholar, and certainly has not been realized by the average Bible reader. The numerous abridged editions of the Scriptures which have appeared in our day have not been constructed on this principle. Apparently they have not even taken it into consideration. Perhaps it was not necessary that they should, from the standpoint (which seems to have been the guiding motive of these selections) of revealing the literary beauties of the English Bible, or of indicating the passages most suitable for moral stimulus and edification. But the result of the neglect of this task of separation, the elimination of temporary matter that the timeless may be revealed, is that average Christian sentiment holds on to much that is not Christian, and that not a few obsolete and superseded beliefs are commonly regarded as part of the genuine Christian revelation.

Needless to say, we are not putting in a plea for an expurgated edition of the

¹ And neither in that Order nor in the *Ritual of the Methodist Episcopal Church (U.S.A.)* are the 'Manual Acts' omitted as in our own regrettable revision of 1881.

Bible. The egregious Bowdler is a warning to all who would make the attempt. We are glad to be able to join hands here with those who contend for 'the whole Bible'. The whole Bible we indeed want, and must have, in order that we may gain an adequate view of the evolution of the religious consciousness, and note, for our own guidance, the stumbles man has made in his upward path to God. But at the same time it must be a Bible in which we are able to distinguish between the transient and the abiding, regarding the one as of merely historic interest, and recognizing the eternal significance of the other.

II

But while our immediate subject is thus part of a wider one, it is undoubtedly true that the largest question concerning the distinction between the temporary and the eternal elements in the New Testament, and the elimination of temporary matter from Christian theology, is presented by the contribution of St. Paul. This is no reflection on his contribution, still less on the greatness of his personality. Indeed, it is the reverse. It is an evidence and outcome of the magnitude of both. Patronizing references to St. Paul recoil on the patronizer. Any one who tries to 'de-bunk' the great Apostle of the Gentiles succeeds only in deflating himself. 'The most noble of the holy men', as Lord Morley described him, he grasped the essence of the Gospel with penetrating insight, and declared it with an energy and an eloquence unsurpassed from his generation to ours. Indeed, it is probably true to say that he entered into the real significance of the personality and teaching of Jesus not only more profoundly than any of the early disciples, but more profoundly than any thinker or interpreter of his day or of any day. 'We can maintain with easy mind that he knew and understood Jesus as no other man ever did, that he interpreted the Christian experiences of Christ and applied the ethical teaching of Jesus to life in a way which the more we study it the more ready we are to call inspired.'¹

But, all the same, it was into his own mind that he received the Gospel, and that mind had been formed by his environment and training. In it there existed ideas and points of view derived from his Jewish background and upbringing. It could not possibly be otherwise, the human mind being what it is. And, *a priori* considerations apart, an examination of his writings reveals, beyond question or cavil, that they contain some distinctively Jewish conceptions, not transformed by Christianity because they could not be—because they were not of a piece with the new revelation.

We must also remember that much of St. Paul's writing was called forth (and therefore inevitably coloured) by the controversies in which he was compelled to engage. If he was to speak to the immediate need of his generation, if he was to be understood and effective, he was bound to use the thought-forms of the time. But there is nothing sacrosanct about thought-forms. They belong to the numerous category of our 'little systems' which 'have their day and cease to be'. In the case of Pauline thought-forms, however, Christian theologians through the ages have done their best, and unfortunately a successful best, to perpetuate modes of argument and exposition which, since they were determined by antithesis to controversies of a temporary nature, had no intrinsic

¹ C. Anderson Scott, *Footnotes to St. Paul*.

hold on permanence. The result of this mistaken endeavour has been that certain of St. Paul's illustrations, analogies and ideas have been given a place in the structure of Christian thought to which they have no right, to the obscuring of his essential principles, and of the essential principles of the Gospel.

III

We may illustrate our theme by referring to two phases of St. Paul's thought where the distinction between the old and the new in his teaching is of special importance. First, his doctrine of the Atonement. Here it is necessary to proceed with care if the distinction is to be in accordance with the facts of the case—if we are to be fair to all the evidence at our disposal. When, for instance, Mr. H. G. Wells says that Paul's mind 'was saturated by an idea which does not appear at all prominently in the reported sayings and teaching of Jesus, the idea of a sacrificial person who is offered up to God as an atonement for sin', and that while 'what Jesus preached was a new birth of the human soul, what Paul preached was the ancient religion of priest and altar and the propitiatory bloodshed',¹ he is going too far. As much too far in one direction as Matthew Arnold goes in the other when he affirms that 'Paul knows nothing of a sacrificial atonement; what Paul knows is a reconciling sacrifice'.² But if Matthew Arnold is certainly astray in saying that St. Paul 'knows nothing of a sacrificial atonement', and Mr. Wells even wider of the mark in declaring that his mind is 'saturated' with it, beyond question the idea is there, and we have here a definite instance of an obsolete conception which needs to be disentangled from the essential and timeless elements of his teaching—especially as this particular conception has had an undue and unfortunate influence on subsequent Christian thought.

There is no doubt that St. Paul sometimes expresses faith in Christ in terms of the sacrificial system of the Old Testament. What else was he to do, if he was to win the ear of those who, like himself, had been brought up on the Old Testament? But to contend that because the religion of the Old Testament was sacrificial, a religion of altar and priesthood, therefore New Testament religion must be of the same nature, that the illustrations and analogies which St. Paul used are equally valid with his fundamental principles, and are entitled to a permanent place in the structure of Christianity, argues a lack of that discriminative faculty which, in every branch of thought, and in theology most of all, is necessary if we are to distinguish between old and new, the non-essential and the essential.

As a matter of fact, even in the Old Testament the sacrificial system, though prominent, was by no means in a position of undisputed supremacy. The best religious teachers of Israel disparaged sacrifice as a means of access to God, and growingly stressed the all-importance of the ethical side of religion as against the ceremonial. The evolution of Old Testament thought in this direction reached its climax in Jesus, who makes no reference to the old system of sacrifices, and by His silence ends for ever its validity.

After this abrogation, any future use of the system could only rightly be for purposes of analogy and illustration, and this, it may be argued, is all that we

¹ *Outline of History*, chap. xxviii, par. 5.

² *St. Paul and Protestantism*, II. 70.

find in St. Paul. But illustrations from a superseded system are fraught with danger. There is apt to be a carry-over which vitiates the comparison; a reading into the new of contaminating ideas from the old. And this is what has happened in the case before us, as the later history of Paulinism proves.

A recent writer has suggested that the influence of the Epistle to the Hebrews is accountable for much misplaced emphasis in the interpretation of St. Paul's teaching on the Atonement. 'We must guard against ascribing to Paul positions and points of view with which the Epistle to the Hebrews has familiarized the mind of later generations.'¹ There is an element of truth in this; but all the same the 'positions and points of view' of the Epistle to the Hebrews are not unknown in Paul. When the same writer says that 'to find a clue to Paul's doctrine of the Cross in the supposed analogy of ancient sacrifices, Levitical or other, is precarious exegesis',² we agree, but there is no need to speak of a *supposed* analogy. The analogy is certainly there. Professor G. B. Stevens summarizes the matter fairly: 'While Paul has made a less frequent and explicit use of sacrificial ideas than we should have expected, it is clear that the system supplied one of the forms of thought by which he interpreted Christ's death'.³ And to exalt a form of thought into part of the permanent setting of the Gospel of Christ, as has been done in this case, is a profound mistake. We are not to cast our conceptions of divine realities into the mould of institutions that were only intended to function as a *πανδαγωὸς ξις Χριστόν*.

There is a genuine Christian idea of sacrifice, but it has nothing in common with the world of altars and their compulsory victims. 'The Cross is the very throne of sacrifice', it has been truly said, 'but it is not an altar'. The interpretation of the Christian idea of sacrifice in terms of 'the blood of beasts on Jewish altars slain' has had a deplorable effect in obscuring the Christian meaning of sacrifice, which is the utter self-giving and self-dedication of love. 'The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ' delights in such sacrifices as the Cross exemplifies, but has no pleasure in victims of the altar. The time has come to recognize that Jesus, in revealing God, has relegated the entire system of Old Testament altar-sacrifices to obsolescence, reduced it to an archaism, remanded it to a place in the historical museum of theological ideas. We urge the recognition of this distinction between old and new in St. Paul in the interests of essential principles as against the inadequacy of preparatory analogues, of eternal truth as against temporary (and in many respects misleading) types.

IV

The second phase of St. Paul's thought where the distinction between old and new in his teaching is of importance, especially in view of modern conditions, is his attitude to sex in general, and to the position of women in particular. Many circumstances render this an urgent question at present, when women are not only claiming but being granted complete equality with men in every field of human activity. Certainly it is one to which no little attention is given, and to which much more will have to be given, if a number of anomalies which shelter under the Christian name are to be cleared out of the way.

¹ Stewart, *A Man in Christ*, p. 236. ² *Ibid.*, p. 236. ³ *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, p. 63.

Mr. Beverley Nichols, in his book, *The Fool Hath Said*, roundly declares that 'the Christian official doctrine towards sex is based, not upon Christ, but upon St. Paul'.¹ He refers to 'a whole host of sexual complexes and phobias . . . which Paul has incorporated in the Christian fabric, in the Name of Christ, but against His spirit'.² We will not follow Mr. Nichols into the psychological mazes where he treads with so assured a step, still less will we assent to his 'writing off' of St. Paul as 'a mind which had not conquered sex'.³ On this point Mr. Nichols' ingenious arguments are not convincing. But, all the same, there is much in his contention that, in the matter of sex, St. Paul went 'astray from the spirit of Christ',⁴ and still more in his contention that it is Paul and not Christ whom the Church has followed in its 'official doctrine towards sex'. 'The Church has always followed him', he says, 'which is the reason for a vast amount of suffering, bigotry, obscurantism and hatred in the world to-day'.⁵ We must sorrowfully admit the large amount of truth in this indictment.

But it is an indictment against the Church, or at any rate against the ecclesiastical interpreters of St. Paul, more than against Paul himself. As a writer previously quoted in this journal says: 'If Paulinism has had not a few disquieting results, let us remember that Paul himself was not to blame, but rather "the arid scholasticism of traditional Pauline interpretation".⁶ This is certainly true in the matter before us. When we remember what the average contemporary Jewish attitude to women was, is it any wonder that even a man of St. Paul's attainments should find it impossible to shake off the incubus of tradition and convention? But those who expounded his teaching, and determined the Church's official doctrines, ought to have estimated his views in the light of the principles laid down in the words and example of Jesus. If they had done so, they would have realized that in Paul's directions concerning women we have, not a statement of the essential Christian attitude, but a residuum of intractable Judaism persisting against the solvent influence of the new evangel.

The elements were strangely mixed in Paul, as they are in everybody. He has his high moments—and they are very high—and moments when he sinks below his own best level. He had a flair for the discovery of great ruling principles, for discerning the general truth in the specific situation. When dealing with the question of meats offered to idols, for instance, and again with the circumcision controversy, he brushes aside the local and the temporary and with masterly insight states the essential and eternal issues involved. But on the question before us it seems that this flair failed him. Though not entirely, and not always, even here. The real man, the real greatness of the man, comes out in such a passage as this: 'There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus'. And it is regrettable that one who had got so near the mind of Christ as this passage indicates, should afterwards have descended to puerilities on the subject of a woman's hair.

But we must not blame him too hardly. If he did not fully realize, or at any rate did not fully carry out in practice, the glorious comprehensiveness of the ideal he had glimpsed, it is not to be wondered at, when we consider his upbringing,

¹ p. 217.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*, p. 219.

⁴ Mr. Nichols says 'wildly astray', which makes the statement more picturesque but less true.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 219.

⁶ Stewart, *op. cit.*, pp. 15, 16.

and the circumstances of the times in which he lived. What is infinitely more regrettable than Paul's lapse from his own highest level, and infinitely less excusable, is that his followers and interpreters should have attempted to canonize for all time the Apostle's directions about the conduct of women in churches. Even if—as has been suggested, but is by no means obvious—there was a sound reason for such directions at the time, in view of conditions then existing, this only means that they are at best to be described as merely *ad hoc* and *pro tem.* It may be a pity that these directions ever found a place in letters which (though such a possibility of course never occurred to the writer) afterwards came to be regarded as Scripture. It is more than a pity that after nineteen centuries there are still those who fail to discriminate between old and new, non-essential and essential, personal idiosyncrasy (as it possibly was in this case) and eternal truth.

If the large-hearted and broad-minded Man of Nazareth, one aspect of whose superhuman greatness is seen in the fact that He was entirely free from a Jew's characteristic prejudices and inhibitions concerning women, had been followed in this matter, we should have been saved from much that is melancholy and tragic, not to say absurd and grotesque. We should at least have been saved from the ridiculous perpetuation of the regulation which forbade women to enter churches unless their hats were in position.

V

Renan, at the close of his book on the Apostle, declared that 'Paul is now coming to an end of his reign'. It is always risky to venture a prophecy in the field of literary or theological reputation, and that was a particularly unfortunate instance. But if Paul is not coming to an end of his reign—indeed, as far as the signs go, is secure on his throne to the end of the ages—it is the contention of this article that it is high time that certain of his ideas came to an end of their vogue.

To say this is by no means to take the position of those who regard St. Paul as the creator of a new religion. To hold that he was the arch corrupter of the Gospel, and the real founder of what afterwards came to be known as Christianity—to assert, with Mr. J. M. Robertson, that 'the Epistles of Paul reveal a stage of Christist propaganda incompatible with any such prior development as is set forth in the Gospel'¹—is an amazing misreading of the facts.

So far from siding with those who urge that 'we should cut Christianity free from everything Pauline in it', on the contrary we agree that 'all the Apostle's great central conceptions came to him straight out of the bosom of Jesus' Gospel'.² His great central conceptions; but not some of his minor ideas. Here he was unquestionably 'under the influence of . . . older Jewish modes of thinking, where these were not really of a piece with the new revelation'.³ And as some of his minor ideas have mistakenly been elevated to a position alongside the central conceptions, as of equal validity if not of equal importance, with consequences from which the Church is still suffering, we urge that Christianity should be 'cut free' from them.

We may summarize the position and argument of this article in the words of

¹ *A Short History of Christianity*, p. 3. ² Stewart, *op. cit.*, p. 18. ³ Bartlet, *The Apostolic Age*, p. 113.

Dr. Maltby: 'No one man has ever made so magnificent and permanent a contribution to Christian thought and the understanding of the Christian message as St. Paul. It is as impossible to dismiss Plato from philosophy as St. Paul from Christian theology.'¹ But, as the same writer says: 'It is a mistaken reverence for the Apostle which builds a tabernacle wherever he left a footprint'.² Such tabernacles have been built; and the time has come to pull them down, or at any rate to recognize that these mistaken and misplaced edifices are of merely antiquarian interest.

A. GARFIELD CURNOW

THE POET-ENGINEER

BEHIND the flower gardens on the parade (or 'Den') of my little town on the South Devon coast sweeps a crescent of solid houses converted into hotels or professional establishments. This crescent looks as if it should be haunted by famous ghosts; but though the town seems to have enjoyed its modest share of fashion in late Georgian and early Victorian times, Royalty passed it by; nor have any legends left us a local Steyne. But for me, at any rate, there is one ever-present shade: that of Isambard Kingdom Brunel.

How could a man with such a name fail to be a 'character', an individualist, a path-finder? Brunel was certainly all three. Born at Portsmouth in 1806, he attended private schools at Chelsea and Hove before being sent to the College Henri Quatre in Paris. But his most vital education was received at home, for his father—Sir Marc Isambard, a naturalized Frenchman, who had been a political adventurer in youth and had narrowly escaped from his own country to America before settling in England and marrying a Plymouth girl—was himself a famous engineer. Isambard Secundus entered the paternal office at the age of seventeen, and one of his first jobs was connected with the Thames Tunnel, on which Sir Marc was engaged. The son, who even at this early age often limited to four his hours of sleep, seems to have preferred the tunnel to the desk, and showed not only precocious ability, but great courage and resourcefulness during the repeated periods of flooding. On one occasion he nearly met his death. The difficulties encountered in building the tunnel moved the Rotherhithe curate to pronounce Brunel's mishap 'but a just judgement upon the presumptuous aspirations of mortal man'. The directors, on the other hand, recorded their admiration of 'that generous principle which induced him to put his own life in more immediate hazard to save the lives of men under his more immediate care'. How the framers of clerical or commercial 'minutes' enjoyed themselves in those days!

To recuperate after his accident Brunel came to the West Country, where, after one unsuccessful attempt, his design for the Clifton Suspension Bridge was accepted. As funds were low, the bridge was not completed until after his death. It was nevertheless the making of his career. His youthful fame impressed some Bristol merchants who had conceived the project of building a Great Western Railway from that city to London. Brunel, in 1833, was appointed engineer. He was then twenty-seven. He had barely as long again

¹ *Christ and His Cross*, p. 101.

² *Ibid.*, p. 119.

to live; but into that time he crowded amazingly versatile activities, from the experimental building of big steamships—of which his 'Great Eastern' was, of course, the most epoch-making—to the design of military hospitals for the Crimea.

One marvels not only at the technical genius of this 'pioneer in an uncharted wilderness of theories and materials', but at the qualities that enabled him to supervise and bring to successful issue tasks so formidable, so varied, and so widely diffused, in days when communications were still slow and there were no telegrams, telephones, or typewriters to ease the burden or to resolve misunderstandings. The feat appears yet the more remarkable when we remember that, in addition to the purely engineering side of his duties, he had to prepare frequent reports for his directors, many of whom needed instruction in the very rudiments of the new science; while, beside negotiating with landowners and town-councils—and *think* what some of them must then have been like!—there was also the business of making provision for supplies of skilled labourers, contractors, and sub-contractors. Brunel may have learned one time-saving devise from his friend Michael Faraday: in his large working-office there was but a single chair! Courteous and friendly to the lowest of his employees, and capable of great powers of public persuasion and even of cynical effusiveness when occasion or tact needed them, he had no patience with triflers; and while the genuine fool might be forgiven, he was unsparing of the sluggard, as an extract from a typical letter will show:

Plain gentlemanly language seems to have no effect upon you; I must try stronger language and stronger measures. You are a cursed lazy inattentive apathetic vagabond, and if you continue to neglect my instructions and to show such infernal laziness, I shall send you about your business. I have frequently told you amongst other untidy habits that that of making drawings on the back of others is inconvenient; by your cursed neglect of that you have again wasted more of my time than your whole life is worth. . . . Let me have no more of this provoking conduct or of the abominable and criminal laziness with which you suffer contractors to patch, scamp, or get rid of their work.

Well, that is that! I have often, with less excuse, wanted to write such letters myself, but have lacked the pluck!

Other engineers have been efficient and far-sighted without capturing the layman's imagination. The appeal of Brunel lies in the artist's vision which he combined with prophetic practical intuition and a passion for perfect material and craftsmanship. In the aesthetic as in the scientific sense, 'he nothing common did or mean'. Even to-day one cannot travel on the Great Western Railway—his first and best-loved 'child'—without visible evidence of its begetter. His beautiful trestle viaducts in wood, after abnormally long service, have now been replaced; but the Maidenhead Bridge, the Wye Bridge at Chepstow, and (noblest of all) the Royal Albert Bridge at Saltash survive, among others, as 'working' examples of his more substantial structures. His ablest contemporaries might declare his designs impracticable. But he scoffed at 'impossibilities', and the Wharncliffe Viaduct and the Box Tunnel remain as further witnesses that, in some respects at least, the laugh of Time is on his side.

What of the Broad Gauge? If he had an eye for majestic detail, Brunel's

whole conception of the Great Western was on the grand—some might say the grandiose—scale. From the start he foresaw the possibility of trains travelling safely at a hundred miles an hour; and, building not merely for the moment, he spared no expense or trouble to make his routes level. Nor did he see why railways should be restricted to a gauge arbitrarily determined by that of the colliery-tramways from which they had originated. *His* expresses should race across England on a seven-foot track! And so, to the envy of rival railway companies, they did. Yet most of those companies, slaves to precedent, had retained the width of the old mineral-plateways, which in turn may have been decided by the measurement—itself probably a matter of chance—between the wheels of some eighteenth-century English carriage or farm-wagon. Fortuitous, indeed, is much evolution on this planet! The late Sir Charles Inglis said that 'when the majority of railway engineers and promotors were looking to railways as mere improvements on public roads, on which vehicles were permitted to pass on payment of tolls', Brunel alone had 'a clear perception of their enormous possibilities'.

Every one knows the sequel. Tradition, such as it was, won the day: though not without a struggle. 'The Battle of the Gauges' roused popular, no less than professional, passions. In 1845 the Government intervened. An inquiry led to engine trials, which evoked an amount of agreement that moved the Commissioners to the 'duty' of observing that 'the public are mainly indebted for the present rate of speed and the increased accommodation of railway carriages to the genius of Mr. Brunel and the liberality of the Great Western Company'. Nevertheless, a uniform national gauge had to be fixed; and since by that time the length of narrow gauge in the country much exceeded that of the wider, Brunel lost the fight. True, Parliament agreed to the retention, and even to the extension, of the Broad Gauge on the Great Western and on the then independent, if connecting, systems in Devon and Cornwall; and it was not until thirty-seven years later that it finally disappeared.

The speed with which the last stages of conversion were carried out is one of the epics of engineering. There was much display of popular sentiment. *Punch* celebrated the event with cartoon and verse, while crowds lined the route to cheer the doomed 'Great Britain' and other loved locomotives of the old brigade. It was on May 20, 1892, that the last 'broad' train from Paddington to Penzance met its counterpart in the station of my own little town; and we are told that, as the trains stood alongside each other, 'the passengers joined hands through the carriage windows of opposite compartments and sang "Auld Lang Syne"'. Elsewhere it was noted that some fervent hand had chalked on the track: 'Good-bye, poor old Broad Gauge, God bless you!' Still, if it had gone, the old gauge had left the Great Western a useful legacy. The amount of land and the generous scale of bridges and tunnels already in its possession stood it in good stead where the doubling or quadrupling of the standard track later became necessary.

There are still those who think that, in 'The Battle of the Gauges', Brunel was on the side of wisdom. However that may be, this stretch of coast was the scene of what is more commonly deemed one of his failures. When, in 1844, he became engineer to the projected South Devon Railway, 'atmospheric propulsion' was, so to speak, in the air. Limited experiments made by engineers in

London and in Ireland had been successful, and Brunel, realizing that westwards of Newton Abbot he could no longer avoid steep inclines, believed that the new motive-power would best suit the new conditions. The scheme involved the laying of a cast-iron pipe between the rails, having a continuous slot along its upper side. Through the pipe travelled a cylinder with a large frame, to which was attached an arm that, projecting through the slot, connected with the vehicles to be moved. The pipe was emptied in front of each train, while air was forced in at the rear.

Brunel's optimism seemed at first to be justified. Speeds of sixty-eight miles an hour were reached with light trains, while passengers liked the smooth running and (as well they might in those days!) the freedom from smoke and flying cinders. Unfortunately a defect arose, due to deterioration of the leather valve along the pipe. Thus the atmosphere, having been harnessed, began to leak; and though some experts are still puzzled by the scrapping of a system that worked admirably but for a single fault that might have been remedied, the experiment was abandoned after eight months' trial. The pumping-stations that were placed at intervals along the line, to supply and regulate the air pressure, survive as mementoes; and sections of the cast-iron pipe, converted into beach-sewers, may still be seen. A less innocent relic is the formidable Dainton Bank between Newton Abbot and Totnes, rising for two-and-a-half miles with what remain the steepest gradients used by main-line expresses anywhere in the world: albeit the proud 'King' locomotives now negotiate them (with trains of normal weight) unassisted.

As an admirer of Brunel, I regret the financial loss he suffered through this misbehaviour of leather. Still, I am glad the air escaped! Otherwise, even if the steam-locomotive had not been universally discarded, the trains that wind so gracefully along our local sea-wall would be as spiritless, as uninspiring to gaze upon, as are the electric ones that now connect London with Brighton or Portsmouth! That terrace for the iron road, separated from the English Channel only by a narrow pedestrian promenade, is, of course, another witness to Brunel's daring and skill. Some faddists pretend that it spoils the part of our shore which it skirts. At Dawlish, where the line actually divides town from beach, there may be cause for complaint. But I think the concensus of opinion regarding our own strip of coast would be quite different. From my observation of their delight, I imagine that thousands of visitors find our east parade one of the most satisfying walks in England. On the one hand, the colour, the voice, of the eternal sea! On the other hand, the loveliness of 'the red cliffs crowned with verdure, starred with flowers'! And, between sea and cliffs, those shining ribbons of metal, along which, after the expectant lull created by the falling of a signal-arm and the vision of distant wreaths of smoke, themselves transmuted by the play of light into an added beauty of the scene, there flashes the 'Cornish Riviera Limited' or the 'Torbay Express', bringing, with its clean rhythm and evenly-pulsing breath, the poetry of man's achievement to complete that of Nature!

GILBERT THOMAS

THE 'RECANTATION' OF THOMAS BILNEY.

THOMAS BILNEY was burned at Norwich in August 1531. He suffered as a relapsed heretic, but the spiritual authorities gave out that before he died he had submitted to the Church, and asserted that at his execution the Cambridge reformer had publicly and completely revoked his errors. Bilney's friends denied the story, and hailed him as a martyr in the evangelical cause. The documents² relating to the case admit of an interpretation which, if at variance with the traditional catholic or protestant versions, accounts for more of the known facts and is in keeping with Bilney's earlier career and his previous 'troubles'.

At Cambridge Bilney had been the leading figure among those scholars who met in the parlour of the White Horse to talk out the arguments they had begun in their walks on 'Heretics' Hill'. They met also for prayer and Bible study in each others rooms, and were accustomed to receive the Sacrament at every principal feast. It was Bilney who won over that young zealot and public nuisance, Hugh Latimer. 'Bilney came to me in my study and desired me for God's sake to hear his confession : and to say the truth, by his confession I learned more than afore in many year : so from this time I began to smell the word of God and forsook the school doctors and all such fooleries.' Latimer joined his new friend on other enterprises : 'I went with him to visit the prisoners in the tower at Cambridge, for he was ever visiting prisoners and sick folk'. Years later, when his friend lay under sentence of death, Latimer paid bold and grateful tribute to his character. 'I have known hitherto few such, so prompt and ready to do every man good after his power, both friends and foes; noisome wittingly to no man, and towards his enemy so charitable, so seeking to reconcile them as he did . . . in sum a very simple, good soul, nothing fit or meet for this wretched world.'³ Even more impressive than the speech of Latimer is the silence of Sir Thomas More, who wielded an agile muck-rake where any heretic was concerned, as to any direct charge against Bilney's character.

There must have been trouble between the Cambridge reformers and the conservative authorities even could the university have been isolated from the context of the contemporary world. As it was, pressure from without and within Cambridge forced the reluctant Wolsey to take action against Bilney and his friends at the end of 1525. Bilney had a personal interview with Wolsey, but, in modern phrase, it was 'off the record' and no judicial oath was taken. He went home after an assurance to the Cardinal that he would not preach Lutheran doctrine. In 1527 a serious and formal charge was made and Bilney was tried. The cardinal and the archbishops left the proceedings to a panel of bishops of whom the leading figure was Cuthbert Tunstal. Mindful of his reputation for humanity and love of letters, Bilney wrote a series of letters begging a personal interview. But Tunstal had no intention of becoming another Latimer, still less another Bilney, and produced these private letters in open court 'in exonerationem conscientiae suae'.

Bilney also had a conscience which was stubbornly intransigent as Tunstal's

² See 'Thomas Bilney' by Harold S. Darby, M.A., B.A., *London Quarterly Review*, Jan., 1942, p. 67.

³ Foxe, *Acts and Monuments* (Townshend ed.), vol. iv (Appx.).

³ Latimer, *Remains* (Parker Soc.), p. 330.

was conveniently malleable. He denied some of the articles laid against him and said that others were garbled misquotations from the sermons he had preached in Norwich and London. This is highly probable, and there can be few preachers who would care to stand their trial on what their congregations remember of their sermons. In this case the witnesses, 'above twenty', More says, including husbandmen, gentlemen, and certain of the 'religious' preaching and mendicant orders, were hostile, for under existing law Bilney was unable to bring witnesses on his own behalf. Other articles are of surprising mildness, while it is a commentary on current orthodoxy that others should ever have been brought as that Bilney said 'Mary Magdalen was a stewyd hoore: howbeit sche afterward turned to grace'. Nor could it be said that, as they stood, they violated Bilney's promise to Wolsey, for the matters they touched were of Lollard, not Lutheran, controversy, shrines, images, pilgrimages and the like.

Bilney persistently denied having preached heresy, though Tunstal twice postponed sentence, granting the prisoner room to consult his friends. At length he yielded to their counsel so far as to make a limited submission, the nature of which deserves careful note. The very memory of it chafed Sir Thomas More who complains that he 'never saw the like of it'. 'His abjuration was such that he therein abjured and forswore all his heresies, knowledging himself lawfully convict. But whereas they be wont to confess in their own abjuration that they have holden such heresies and be guilty thereof, that he wold do in no wise: but as clearly as his fault was proved, and by as many, yet wold he not to die therefore confess himself faulty, but always stood still upon it in virtue of his oath that they all denied him.'¹ Even this compromise did not satisfy him. He stood in Paul's, he bore his faggot, but in the months afterwards, a prisoner in the Tower, he brooded on his submission, haunted by the thought that he had betrayed the cause. When he returned to Cambridge at the end of 1528 he was a broken and inconsolable spirit. Latimer spoke later of his distress.

Little Bilney, that blessed martyr of God what time he had borne his faggot and was come again to Cambridge had such conflicts within himself beholding this image of death, that his friends were afraid to let him alone. They were fain to be with him day and night, and comfort him as they could: but no comforts would serve. And as for the comfortable places of scripture, to bring them unto him, it was as though a man would run him through the heart with a sword.

He found peace in deliberate action. One evening he left Cambridge, telling his friends he was 'going up to Jerusalem'. It was an heroic act for a timorous soul in a weak body. He preached in the diocese of Norwich where his worst enemies were to be found and it is credibly reported that he preached in the open field. He visited the lady anchoress² in Norwich; leaving this successor of the Lady Julian to meditate on Tyndale's New Testament, and his *Obedience of a Christian Man*, proscribed books. It may well be that like Dr. Crome and Latimer, he spoke of the doctrine of purgatory, for all three were in trouble that year and the subject was of controversy. But Bilney's activities were independent of theirs and the rumour of what he was saying and doing led the aged

* More, *Works* (ed. Campbell), p. 196.

* Probably Dame Agnes Edrygge, recluse there in 1524 (Blomefield, *Hist. Norfolk*, iv. 81).

Bishop Nix, half reluctantly, to order the arrest of the reformer. Bilney was tried and condemned, degraded, and handed to the secular arm.

Gairdner found the clue to the confusion which arises at this point in an appeal which Bilney made to the royal supremacy.¹ The explanation is much simpler. This was no new battle over a royal title, but an ancient conflict, that between the spiritual and temporal authorities. The plain fact of the matter is that the representative of the secular arm, Edward Reed, mayor of Norwich and the bishop's commissary, Dr. Pellis, were at loggerheads. The documents make it plain that this was the reason for the posthumous investigation into the events at Bilney's death, and that Reed was made to answer for 'certain articles put in against him by Dr. Pellis'. For the mayor, with most of his aldermen, was sympathetic toward Bilney, a Norfolk man of high character and good reputation whose preaching won wider sympathy among the people than we might suppose from the pronouncements of the spiritual authorities or the judgements of some modern historians. Twice during the trial the mayor intervened on Bilney's behalf. Then he angered the commissioner by demanding and then confiscating the homilies begun by Bilney in prison. He then refused to notify Dr. Pellis of the time and place of the execution. When that took place he so acted as to cause Pellis to send a strong complaint to Sir Thomas More. It is against this background that we must examine the evidence for the supposed 'retraction'.

Immediately after his condemnation and his degradation Bilney protested against any sentence of excommunication, and asked absolution, and that he might receive the Blessed Sacrament. Had he already made a complete recantation, it would seem that there was no reason why Dr. Pellis should 'greatly stick', as More admits, to give him this privilege. The incident must be seen in relation to what followed, at the actual execution. When that took place, in the 'Lollards Pit' outside Norwich, Edward Reed stationed himself as close to Bilney as he could come. Suspecting that there might not be fair play he wrote down, as soon as he got home, 'as far as he could bere way' of what was said and done. Then he called together the aldermen and asked their agreement on some facts of the case, as he would be going to London shortly and would have to present a report. A Bill of Revocation was then produced by Dr. Pellis who asked that it might be exemplified under the town seal as the document handed to Bilney in prison, and afterward presented to him and read out by him at the stake. On hearing the contents of this Bill several members agreed with the mayor that this was not what they had heard Bilney read, but when they heard Reed's own account of the proceedings they at once accepted it as what they, too, had heard, and agreed that this and this alone should go forward as their agreed statement. There was, however, one dissentient, whose evidence is the other notable document beside the testimony of the mayor. This was one John Curatt, alderman of Norwich, much in favour with the spiritual authorities, but decidedly '*persona non grata*' with his fellow aldermen. He objected to the mayor's account. It is very important to note the grounds of his objection. So far from contradicting what the mayor had said, he agreed that he 'touched the truth in every point'. His objection was that

¹ The appeal was certainly made, and probably followed a more startling appeal made earlier. (by Nicholas Hawkins?) (see L. & P., Hy. VIII, 1531, No. 148; Sturge, *Tunstal*, 192, n. 3).

the mayor's account omitted to mention that Dr. Pellis handed to Bilney a document which was read out. Moreover, Curatt himself refused to accept the document as authentic which Dr. Pellis had presented to the aldermen. Reed said to him, 'Marry, here is a copy thereof as Doctor Pellis has promised me upon his truth and honesty'—as for that quod Curatt, 'I will believe no man so well as myself, for I know that Bill among a hundred bills'.

What then was contained in Bilney's 'revocation'? The Catholics claimed that it was a complete recantation. There is of course, *a priori*, no impossibility in this. It had happened in 1521 in the case of Thomas Harding that at the very last he had desired absolution and to be received back into the Church. The Protestants went to the other extreme and denied that Bilney took any document at all. Up to a point, however, Foxe's argument is not bad. He says 'it is not likely'.¹ The man who deliberately 'went up to Jerusalem', and who in his last moments writes about justification by faith, is 'not likely' to have changed so suddenly from his previous convictions. But there is an explanation which covers most of the facts and accounts for the confusion which so evidently surrounds the story. It is that Bilney, though refusing to renounce any fundamental conviction, was ready to speak against anything wherein he could be shown to have caused public scandal, especially if by so doing he might receive the precious sacraments of the Church. Such a compromise is not only in line with his previous retraction in 1527, but it explains also why the commissioner 'greatly stuck' at giving him the sacraments he desired. The commissioner might well reflect that the impression made upon the public would be of a complete revocation. And indeed, but for the mayor and his colleagues, this would have been the case. Turning to the documents, we find confirmation of this hypothesis.² But the accounts of the execution begin with another confusing element. Bilney twice addressed the crowd, first on entering the place of execution, and next after Pellis had given him a Bill. At least one historian³ seems to have thought that what the mayor wrote down was the matter of the first speech, and since a hasty reading of Curatt's testimony does give this impression, it is worth clarifying the evidence at this point. Edward Reed makes it clear that what he wrote down was Bilney's 'Revocation'.

This deponent saith that when Bilney had read softly the same bill or parcell of it as it appeared to the deponent that the said Bilney so did, the same Bilney then declared openly to the people his mind therein (touching the same Bill) which matter for so much as to this deponents perceiving did not declare in all points the same Bill which this deponent had seen and heard before of Dr. Pellis being in the chapel aforesaid. This deponent came therefore as near as he could hear and conceive in his remembrance did afterwards put in writing.

This is quite clear: what Reed remembered was of Bilney's opinions concerning the Bill of Revocation. It is quite distinct from the 'good and godly exhortation' which the mayor, at the beginning of his evidence, states that Bilney gave on entering the place of execution.

¹ Foxe's witness was an honourable one, Matthew Parker, himself a Norwich man. But he testified many years later and though an eyewitness, was not so close to the scene as the two witnesses whose evidence is considered here.

² The best piece of evidence for the catholic contention was never produced, then or since. The Bill quoted by Dr. Pellis did not survive and yet it would have made excellent propaganda.

³ T. F. Tout in *D.N.B.*, art. 'Bilney.'

If we turn now to what Bilney, according to Reed, declared to the people we find they correspond to what we have already surmised. He begins by excusing the four orders of Friars for responsibility in his death (some people saw in it another example of the ancient jealousy between regular and secular clergy). He clears the character of the lady anchoress of Norwich. He acknowledges that to preach without licence was a breach of law, and affirms the duty of obeying the authorities in church and state. He repeatedly asserted his belief in the catholic church (which may have led Parker who caught these words of Bilney's raised voice to believe that he recited the whole Creed). He remits the question of marriage of the clergy to the doctors of the universities. Finally he defends the practice of fasting. Here are no serious heresies at all. But they are exactly what a conscientious man might yield to the authorities. If they said to him: 'Look at the public scandal you have occasioned. The Friars Preachers are defamed. The lady anchoress suspected of heresy. Men and women, encouraged by you, are speaking against the lawful authority of church and state. You have lowered the respect for the voice of the church, as the deviser of godly practices and discipline.' As in 1527, Bilney would be ready for the peace of the Church, to make any concession which did not violate his conscience. It was agreed that he should make a statement about these matters, and at the last Dr. Pellis produced the Bill. Bilney took it and read it through, his lips moving as he read it (the interpretation of 'reading softly'?). Then lifting his head and raising his voice he spoke to the people about those things. Whether he read all the Bill is doubtful: what else may have been on it we shall never know. It is a great pity that Mr. Reed did not bear away a little more, for we can hardly believe the peroration of the last sermon of a great preacher ended with the subject of 'Fasting: Scriptural Proof'.

John Curatt's testimony is not more enlightening. His excuse is a little too ingenuous. He affirms that he heard everything, 'saving that in the latter end of reading the same bill the deponent was constrained to stoop to mend his shoe, and so heard not the conclusion'. At such a critical moment we suspect a more than physical constraint. But there is one point of Curatt's evidence which has misled at least one writer. At first sight it seems that he speaks throughout of these articles as pertaining to Bilney's first speech, the 'good and godly exhortation'. But here are his own words:

He stood near that he might well hear every word that the same Bilney did speak there at that time. So that when the same Bilney speaking of fasting saying that he knew himself that he erred when he preached against fasting, bringing in and declared the history of Judith and divers other histories and authorities of scripture

[here is the bottom of the page in the MS. and Curatt begins a new page and paragraph.]

And so when the said Bilney had said his mind unto the people the same Bilney came toward the stake where Dr. Pellis took out the same Bill.

The first impression given by this is that it was in his first address that Bilney spoke against his former preachings regarding fasting. But this is not so. Curatt is giving proof that he has stood near enough to hear all that was said, and is giving an example from what Bilney said about fasting, but he comes to the end of a page with this sentence hanging in the air: it is not only a parenthesis but an unfinished one. Moreover the words regarding fasting are definitely ascribed

to Bilney's 'Revocation' even by Curatt, and we have seen that Curatt accepted Reed's narrative, only demurring at his omission of the handing over of the Bill. Reed, on the other hand, was unwilling to make much of the Bill at all, since he strongly suspected that the spiritual authorities were out to make it more than it really was.

Finally, Reed could not be shaken from his convictions even when cross-examined by Sir Thomas More. Confronted by the cleverest lawyer of the day, he did not go back upon his earlier evidence, though he admitted that there was some sort of Bill, and that he had heard Bilney ask for absolution. Sir Thomas More, who had a large faculty for believing what he wanted to believe, chose to think that Bilney had made a complete retraction, yet he had no more evidence to go upon than that which is available to us. That evidence shows a consistency in the character of Thomas Bilney, the same hesitancy of a man of conscience, the same willingness to do all that could be granted for the avoidance of public scandal. It fits the proceedings of his earlier trial, and the last letters he penned on the very eve of his death. He loved the catholic church and treasured her sacraments. But there is no reason whatever to suppose that he renounced the gospel of the grace and glory of God which had constrained him to preach unletted by any human jurisdiction. None the less, the authorities partly succeeded. They had blurred the issue. Bilney was no Lollard, but a considerable figure with a not undistinguished following in the Universities. The trumpet had sounded an uncertain note. 'Remember Bilney' warned Tyndale as he wrote to his brother John Frith as he too came near to the fiery furnace. The death of Bilney marks a stage. Hitherto in England the Lollards had provided most of the material for trials of heresy. Like other mediaeval sects these underground movements existed by building a mask of subterfuge and masquerade. Now the stage was set for a more courageous witness. There was enough truth in Sir Thomas More's sneer at the perfidy of heretics to make it sting. Frith and Tyndale were soon to give an inspiring example. Bilney had been a leader of great personal influence, but he was always something of a Mr. Fearing. At Smithfield Mr. Standfast, and in the Low Countries Mr. Valiant for Truth, were to point a more excellent way.

It is a great pity that in any account of Bilney documents of a legal character covering only the last few weeks of his life should loom so large. Latimer looked back with affection on 'Saint Bilney'. He remembered the man who changed the current of his life in an afternoon's conversation: the man who gave lavishly to the poor in money and in charitable act: the leader who had set the example in comforting those in prison and in lazaret house. He revered the man for whom the gospel that the 'stewyd hoore' might afterwards be turned to grace, was no abstraction, but the proven fruit of a ministry among the Magdalenes and the Penitent Thieves. When we consider this man and his friends, their prayers and Bible readings, their devotion to the Sacrament, their evangelical zeal in preaching, their unremitting service of the outcast, we may well feel that Thomas Bilney deserves a higher place in the annals of the English Church. After all, what estimate should we make of the leaders of the Evangelical Revival if a few years after the 'Holy Club' had been formed in Oxford, Whitefield and Charles Wesley had been thrown in prison, and John Wesley (like Bilney, 'a little single body in person, but always of a good upright counten-

ance') burned at the stake? In his annotated Bible one passage is deeply underlined. From it he found the words with which he took leave of his friends.

Fear not, for I have redeemed thee and called thee by thy name: thou art mine own. When thou goest through the water I will be with thee and the strong floods shall not overflow thee. When thou walkest in the fire it shall not burn thee, and the flame shall not kindle upon thee, for I am the Lord thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour.

There is no suggestion even by his enemies but that he died bravely, and we may believe that he found strength for the fire. As for the waters beyond, we may find for him what was written of another Mr. Fearing, that at his crossing, the river was lower than ever it was before and 'that he went over at last not much above wet shod. He was well at the last.'

E. GORDON RUPP

Notes and Discussions

INDIA AND DEMOCRACY¹

THE outbreak of war in the Pacific has made this a very timely book. Sir George Schuster believes that the solution of the problem of India is to be found in co-operation between Indians and Englishmen. And surely, in the present crisis, when Japanese forces are pressing towards the gates of India, there is no alternative to Sir George's policy.

Guy Wint, who has recently spent two years in India, writes the earlier portion of this book. He very well reminds us of the vast territory covered by the word India. Here is a land which is more a continent than a country, a state too big, and with a society too loosely knit for the emergence of a national state such as England or France. What is the problem of India? It is the task of welding together in one self-governing democracy many widely different peoples. What a clash of customs, habits, languages and religions these four hundred millions of people present.

Indian society is very sharply and deeply divided. Some of us were brought up on the creed that the Caste System in India is a fourfold system. There are the Brahmins, who are the priests; the Kashatriyas, who are the warriors; the Vaisyas, the traders; and the Sudras, the servants; so we were told. But Wint says there are not four castes in India, but many hundreds of castes. What a curse upon one's life, to be told that the sight of one's footprints on the road would pollute a Brahman, hence the necessity of carrying a broom to sweep away one's footprints. Wint says, 'It is hard not to believe that for the deep rifts and disunity which are admittedly the distinguishing feature of Indian society, caste more than any other single factor has been responsible'.

The other deeply divisive feature of India is, the feud between the Hindu and the Moslem. Mr. Jinnah is the leader of the Moslems, of whom there are probably one hundred millions. They are the second largest party in India. Mr. Jinnah, according to Wint, is to a certain extent in the position of a modern Carson. The fear of the Moslems is, that the present emergency may be exploited by the Hindus, their more numerous rivals.

When we add to these facts this further fact, that one-third of the territory of India and about one-quarter of the population of India are governed by native princes, we see the complexity of the Indian question. It will need a stroke of super-statesmanship to weld these conflicting elements into a unity.

Wint traces the attempt of Great Britain to ensure the attainment of parliamentary self-government by India at the earliest possible moment. British rule had already given to India a sense of unity which it had never known before, when in 1927 the Simon Commission began its work. Those deliberations culminated in the Government of India Act of 1935. Whatever may have been the shortcomings of this Act, it did give the vote to thirty-six millions of people in India. Competent judges affirm, that if the politicians of India had realized their opportunity, and shown a willingness to co-operate with Great Britain, India would in a few short years have attained Dominion Status within the British Commonwealth of nations.

But the Indian Nationalists would have little to do with the Act, and with the outbreak of war, what semblance of co-operation there was between Congress and Great Britain was brought to an end. Congress Provincial Ministries resigned, and deadlock resulted, which deadlock has continued to the present time.

There is a brighter side to the picture. It is to be found, as Wint points out, in the

¹ By Sir George Schuster, K.C.S.I., K.C.M.G., M.C., and Guy Wint. (Macmillan, 12s. 6d.)

fact that in the four provinces where Congress did not gain a majority in the legislature—Bengal, Punjab, Sind and Assam—the parliamentary system is still being carried on under the Act.

Wint has a good chapter on Gandhi. Gandhi's doctrine of non-violence, his desire for simplicity, his hatred of Western civilization, his passion for India's independence, his campaigns of civil disobedience, all make him a unique figure. While acknowledging Gandhi's great services to India, Wint wonders whether he has not retarded India's march to self-government. And what an irony it would be, if the apostle of non-violence were by his campaigns of civil disobedience to let loose lawlessness on a big scale in India. Is Wint apt in his comparison, when he likens Gandhi to an Oriental William Booth?

Schuster in Part II of this book outlines the practical tasks of government. He wants to see the people of India better fed. Sound economic policy is one of India's great needs. Industrial development alone is not sufficient to lift Indian standards of life, hence the author pleads for a better agricultural policy, and an increased productivity of labour. But India's economic problem is part of a world-wide problem which can be solved only by international co-operation. Those who say that the British capitalist exploits the Indian people, would do well to see the trade figures given on page 313 of this book. The figures for the last full year before the war, 1938-9, show that Indian imports from the United Kingdom were £34.8 millions, and her exports to the U.K. were £43½ millions, i.e. a favourable Indian balance of £8½ millions, and that to the privation of Lancashire.

But India needs also to be kept free from the invader. Pandit Nehru recently, in an outspoken speech, in reply to a speech of Mr. Amery's, said, 'We have had enough of you, get out'. But what Indian leader with a sense of responsibility would really wish to see India denuded of British military power at the present time? Assuredly Schuster is right when he says that sufficient forces for defence, is one of Britain's obligations to India in this crisis.

India's world relationships are well discussed in a later chapter. If India were to cut the knot that binds her to Britain, with whom would she link up? Schuster says there are five possibilities before her. She might seek to attach herself to any one of the following groups: A Central European, A Slavonic, A Far Eastern, An American, and lastly a group centred around the British Commonwealth. India's ultimate advantage is to be found in working out her destiny as a member of the British Commonwealth, but it must be equal membership of the Commonwealth.

Now is the time to make a fresh start towards the solution of this great problem. Is it too much to hope, that Indian political leaders will stretch out the friendly hand of co-operation to Britain?

J. F. HUMPHREY

A FAITH TO FIGHT FOR: Communism or Christianity

A FEW years ago a week-end house party of distinguished people met to discuss the question, 'What is Christianity?' The conference was not arranged by the Christian Social Council or Toc H or the Regnal League or any other Christian organization. The study text-book for the week-end was not Harnack's famous series of lectures with that title. Probably most of the company had never heard of it. They felt quite capable of discussing such a question, though probably most of them seldom went to church. Still they were clever people living in a Christian country and had no doubt

¹ By John Strachey.

heard a great deal about the Christian religion when they were young both at home and at school. Lawyers, journalists, actors, playwrights, philosophers, whose names were well known to their fellow-countrymen, should be capable of answering so simple a question. After long and serious discussions they reached two sapient conclusions : (1) they did not know what Christianity was and (2) if they wanted to know they had better study the recent history of Communism. One of them proceeded to do this but he also read and re-read the Gospels at the same time with great profit to himself. He discovered that Jesus was the most brilliant of all the philosophers. This appealed to him because he was a philosopher himself. Jesus has an amazing gift for speaking to men in their own language. After straining out of modern Communism its revolutionary violence, he found many parallels between the spread of that gospel and the early growth of the Christian religion. He wrote a book on the subject which made a strong appeal to many of the younger generation. Old Christians may find it difficult to adjust their minds to such views as these, but they should make the attempt to understand what the restless and disturbed mind of European youth is groping after.

I

No one can read Mr. John Strachey's recent book, *A Faith to Fight For*, without being impressed by its sincerity and intense conviction. It is real and alive from the first page to the last. Mr. Strachey calls himself a Socialist not a Communist. For the purpose of this discussion the difference is immaterial. The Communist of the Third International claims to be the orthodox modern disciple of Karl Marx. The elements of the Marxisan gospel that appeal to Mr. Strachey seem to be precisely those emphasized by our modern philosopher in his discussion on the relation between Christianity and Communism. What hurts these earnest thinkers as they survey modern life is the injustice and cruelty of our civilization to the poor and the unprivileged. They cannot be put off with the plea that things are getting better, that the standard of living is rising or that at last we have insured men and women against the dangers of unemployment. They see any long continued uselessness or unemployment whether of rich or of poor as an entirely evil thing. They think that men's lives could be indefinitely improved if society or the state would let the best heart and brain of man play freely round this problem. They think that a great wave of faith in the value of such efforts would have all the power of a great religious revival. Much of this talk seems mere humanism ; another of these attempts of men to lift themselves by their own braces into Utopia. The power of God is not involved. If a man is justified by faith, he is justified by faith in himself, which is really salvation by works over again. A deeper investigation of the aim and purpose of such tendencies, however, shows that this criticism is unjust. They are really seeking for Aristotle's fulcrum from which to move the world and therefore they must go out of themselves to find it.

II

Mr. Strachey is sure that nothing can be done until the German horror is destroyed. He is a grim realist in his picture of what a German victory would mean to the complacent people of these islands. German fanaticism can, however, never be defeated by a British Commonwealth that has lost its faith. When it meets a faith equal to its own (as in Russia) the real struggle begins. His book was written just before the Russian horror was added to those already witnessed in other countries, yet his main thesis is demonstrated by that Titanic struggle. When faith meets faith then comes the tug of war. The collapse of France was a collapse of faith in a country that had lost its unity and its soul. On British faith he has some surprising things to say. He is no Christian but he shows how Christianity helped to keep truth

and love alive in the downfall of the Roman Empire and in the Middle Ages. He thinks that in that period the British people lived by their own not particularly distinct and not particularly important variety of the 'general Catholic faith.' He then goes on to say: 'It was in the next age, in the age of the Reformation and the Renaissance, that we evolved a characteristic faith of our own. That faith was, it is true, one variant of the new Protestant form of Christianity which for certain definite, and in the last resort economic, reasons was appearing all over Europe. But the variety of Protestantism which we developed was so vigorous, and played so vital a part in the history of the epoch, that it is fair to regard it as the essential faith of the British people.' We may ignore the lip-service that Mr. Strachey pays to the Marxian economic interpretation of history. It would be idle to deny that economic causes have their influence in great religious movements, but that influence has been generally of a very secondary nature. Otherwise, this statement expresses a great truth about our British reaction to religion which is often forgotten. Naturally, he stresses the value of this faith in checking the tyranny of Spain and in laying the foundations of our political liberty in the seventeenth century. 'In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the British people still held to the Protestant, Puritan type of faith, but that faith was gradually watered down. It grew milder and more civilized, less narrow and bigoted, but also thinner and weaker. Still it served us marvellously well; it proved a well-spring of self-assurance for further gigantic national achievements—such as beating off Napoleon, setting up the first industrialized system that the world has ever seen, and founding (partly by the foulest methods) a very odd sort of Empire. To-day, in the twentieth century, all we have to live by is the remains of that Protestant, Puritan faith, which was young and strong three hundred years ago; and it is not enough. It is true that it is turning out that there is more in that faith that is still sound and valid for our day than some of us had realized. But yet many aspects of it are obsolete, and incompetent to meet the needs and problems of to-day.'

III

Much of this is very true and very well expressed. The Christian Church is in no need of patronage from the representatives of materialistic Socialism. At the same time we may be glad to hear that Mr. Strachey finds much that is still valid in our Protestant Puritanism. When we turn to the general argument of his book we find that his materialism disappears. The world is not to be ruled by economic but by moral forces. We are fighting desperately for our existence against a creed that man is 'so irredeemably bad that he cannot be ruled except by means of lying, force, hatred and terror.' That abominable creed cannot be defeated by an easy-going assumption that the general decencies of life must prevail. It can only be overcome by a passionate belief in the very opposite of all this. Mr. Strachey pins his hope on the abiding values of truth and love. Lying must be met and defeated by truth, and force and hatred and terror by love. Of course these virtues are not operative without instruments to express them. We live in a rough world where the creed must be fought for. They are the only things worth fighting for and consequently worth living for. 'That odd, blind, obstinate instinct which made us fight for London, instead of "sensibly" surrendering like Paris, arose in us, not only because we did not fancy being a subject people; but also because we did still believe in something, even though we had forgotten its name. We obscurely knew, this last September, that there was something which must not, and should not, perish from the earth.' If truth and love are to have their chance in shaping the world of to-morrow cruelty and lies must be resisted now. It may be possible to carry a nation into an intense faith in the great abstract qualities of truth and love without religion but it seems very improbable in spite of all Mr. Strachey's sincere and earnest pleas. He is, however, on the highway

ges. He to the Kingdom. Truth and love are eternal values. They belong to the very character of that Eternal Father who has been revealed to us by Jesus. The book ends with a chapter on leadership and democracy. 'We as a people cannot act until and unless we throw up leaders through whom we can act.' All hinges, therefore, on the great question of leadership. We Christians believe that we have an answer to that question. If the armies of truth and love need a leader we believe that we know where he can be found. That is where religion comes in.

A. W. HARRISON

LIBERTY UNDER THE STUARTS¹

ALMOST forty years ago, in an article upon *The French Monarchy*, his second important work, I ventured to describe Dr. James Mackinnon as the Macaulay of the twentieth century. Since then an almost continuous stream of volumes of first-rate historical importance has flowed from his tireless pen, the majority of which it has been my privilege to review, sometimes at considerable length. From first to last I have never found any reason to modify my early judgement. In the wide range of his researches, in his knowledge of sources, primary and secondary alike, and in attractiveness of presentation I know of no modern historian who so forcibly recalls the great master of a century ago. It was therefore with no small interest that I turned to Professor Mackinnon's recently issued volume, to which it is my pleasure to direct the attention of the readers of the *London Quarterly Review*. Some thirty-three years ago I wrote a notice of Volume III of *The History of Liberty*, and did so in expectation of welcoming the fourth volume at an early date. But circumstances rendered this impossible. The appointment of Dr. Mackinnon to the Regius Chair of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Edinburgh, as he himself informs us in his preface, made it imperative that he should direct his researches on other lines. But now at long last, when hope of seeing it had almost disappeared, it has made an appearance which is more than welcome to the admirers of the Professor's work, among whom the writer of this paper must claim a foremost place.

The period covered by this volume is short, little more than forty years (1647-89); but it is one of surpassing interest and importance. It opens when the struggle between Charles I and his Parliament was virtually decided; it witnessed the establishment of a new autocracy, which passed away like a dream; then came a great reaction, the wild orgy of the Restoration, which eventuated in the growing despotism of the restored line, and the gradual change of frenzied loyalty into an ever deepening discontent; it closes with the utter collapse of royal despotism, a collapse which ushered in a new era in the constitutional and political life of Britain. The Stuart doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings had become a thing of the past; it had given place to the principle of hereditary succession, originating nominally in the national choice, and not in any supposed investiture of the sovereign and his successors by divine authority.

Professor Mackinnon's story begins with the last efforts of Charles I to repair his losses. The infatuated king still trusted in his state craft, and deluded himself into the idea that those by whom his plans had been brought to nought could not do without him. He essayed to play off one party against the other, playing fast and loose with each in turn, a policy which was foredoomed to failure, and which speedily cost him his head—the victim of his own duplicity. Professor Mackinnon's handling of the character and the fate of Charles is discriminating, but by no means unsympathetic; it reveals in no small measure that kind of imagination which is so necessary to the historian, the power to see things from a point of view far removed from his own. In

¹ *A History of Modern Liberty*. By James Mackinnon, D.D., LL.D. (Longmans, 16s.)

reply to the question whether Charles died as a martyr or a delinquent, his answer is 'as both'. He was a man fanatically loyal to his principles, wrongheaded as they may seem to be—'a practical autocracy in Church and State, a King supreme in Council and Convocation, and virtually supreme in Parliament, was his ideal, and this ideal was to him the sum and substance of the divine will and the constitution of the realm'. In this ideal he honestly believed, and it is, perhaps, not unfair to suppose that he wished to realize it for the general good. 'He was earnest, conscientious, well-meaning if ever King was, and all through his reign allowed himself no relaxation from the duty of doing his best, and what he held to be for the best for the nation.' But he was a man born out of due time, and was utterly unfitted to handle the problems of his own. Of insight into and sympathy with the forces that went to the making of a new age, 'so different in many respects from that age to which he was wedded by instinct and tradition, he had none'. He could make no allowance for men on measures that did not fit themselves into his own narrow and rigid scheme of things. Hence, when confronted by men like Eliot, Pym and Cromwell, he was bound to come to grief. But why must his victorious antagonists have his blood? Might they not have been content with his deposition and banishment? Professor Mackinnon's answer is that 'a man who never knew when he had been defeated, who learned nothing and forgot nothing, was a difficult man to leave at large even in a foreign land'. He was a man whom no agreement could bind, whose political faithlessness was notorious, and who, when ostensibly dealing with one party, was always intriguing with another. But, even so, we entirely agree with the dictum of Professor Mackinnon that 'his execution was a mistake as well as a tragedy. As the act of an illegal court, which was the instrument of an armed faction, it shocked the large majority of his subjects.' The revulsion which it evoked prepared the way for the Restoration.

In his judgement of Charles' great antagonist Cromwell Professor Mackinnon is less favourable than the generality of modern historians. Cromwell was in fact little less of an autocrat than Charles himself; and, in his determination to be the vicegerent of the Almighty, he did not shrink from the last expedient of the born dictator, military despotism. For a permanent settlement the only alternatives were 'a real republic or an ultimate restoration; and Cromwell, in insisting so imperiously on establishing a government dependent on his own personality, and standing so stubbornly in the way of the establishment of such a republic, was doing his best to make the acceptance of the latter alternative sooner or later a necessity.' In a word 'his action, in certain important crises, was unwise, arbitrary and unjustifiable'. Though, on the face of things, the Puritan revolution may thus seem to have been a failure when judged in the light of all the facts this was by no means the case 'and no one knew or came to know this better than Charles II, even if in the closing years of his reign he managed to dispense with Parliament. The revolution had made it impossible henceforth for a King of England to govern in opposition to the will of the nation. It had shown that it was a risky thing for even a Parliament to attempt to do so. Still more clearly did it appear in the case of James II that the will of even the most obstinate of kings must break when confronted with the decisive 'no' of the nation. Unequivocal testimony that this was indeed the case was a little later afforded by the introduction into the coronation ceremony of Queen Anne of the Parliamentary Test and the Coronation Oath. These were in effect a legal declaration that the theory of Divine Right had become a thing of the past, and that the sovereign must henceforth enter into a solemn pact with his people as a condition of receiving the crown.'

Professor Mackinnon's treatment of the policy and aims of the two sons of Charles I leaves little room for criticism. It is well balanced and eminently fair. Though he does full justice to their faults, he does not write as a partisan, and his account of

quent, these two reigns may profitably be read side by side with the somewhat onesided, though brilliant narrative of Lord Macaulay. In matters of religion Charles II seems to have leaned decidedly towards toleration, and to have been honestly desirous to effect a scheme of comprehension, which might have made it possible for the warring Protestant sects to co-operate together. To effect this a certain amount of 'give and take' on both sides was, of course, indispensable. This neither side was willing to accord; and it is not easy to say which of them was the more in fault.

Into Dr. Mackinnon's presentation of Scottish affairs it is impossible here to enter but in any detail. As one might expect he is very much at home in this portion of his work; his treatment is eminently fair, and he does not allow racial feeling to bias his judgment as a historian. It is an ugly story of brutal repression on the one hand, and, added by readers of Buckle will remember, of fanatical unreason and savage impracticability men on the other. Toleration was as alien to the Covenanting policy as to that of the most extreme Episcopalian. One pleasing feature is the picture of the Duke of Monmouth as here presented. Against the dark background of that intolerant age, his toleration and kindly sympathy for those to whom he was opposed shines with a pure, bright flame. It is well that this should be remembered to the credit of one whose memory is clouded by a dark shadow of weakness, folly and misfortune; and who wrought the ruin of his brilliant prospects, and brought his head to the block by consenting to become the tool of men stronger and more wicked than himself.

There are other points which we had noted for some comment, in particular the two closing chapters on 'Relative Political Thought,' a series of critical studies upon the outstanding thinkers of the period and their theories of government. But our space is gone, and we can add that Professor Mackinnon's latest volume is a monument of industry and learning. The author has once again given evidence of unwearyed research among the original sources of our knowledge of the period, and appears to have made himself familiar with practically all that has since been written about it that is worth remembering. He manifests on almost every page critical judgement, and fine historic sense; he relives the past, and has the gift of a vivid and attractive style which enables him to hold the attention of the reader. His latest work is worthy of Professor Mackinnon at his best; we can hardly give it higher praise than this.

W. ERNEST BEET

THE CHURCH WHICH IS HIS BODY

To an increasing number of Christians in these days the one light amidst the darkness of a collapsing civilization is the emergence of the world Church. The familiar patterns of life are rapidly disappearing; the society based upon the sub-Christian values of economic man is crumbling into ruin; but 'the city of God remaineth', and its citizens are in every land. This is the theme of the latest book issued by the Religious Book Club: *Then and Now: The Historic Church and the Younger Churches*, by the Rev. John Foster, M.A., a Methodist minister and Professor of Church History in the Selly Oak Colleges.

In arresting fashion Mr. Foster draws attention to the parallel between our own times and that collapse of the Roman Empire in the fifth century which preceded the Dark Ages of European history, and he bids us remember the manner in which the Church of that day faced the collapse of civilized life. When St. Augustine wrote *De Civitate Dei* ('Concerning the City of God'), he gave expression to the Church's triumphant faith that there is an eternal world order which cannot be destroyed, to which Christians belong, and of which the Church itself is the nucleus. The Church

is of its essence supra-mundane, something not limited by race or geography, but eternal, for it is the life of God in the soul of man. It belongs to an order of existence that cannot be destroyed by the powers of the material world, and the gates of hell cannot prevail against it.

It was this vision that enabled the Church to survive the Dark Ages, and which in every age has led the missionary pioneers of the Faith to challenge the powers of darkness and to offer the Gospel to men of every race. As Mr. Foster says: 'Mission are the life of the Church, the expression of essential Christianity. Whenever the Church revives, it is to become again the Church preaching the Gospel to every creature.'

The 'Younger Churches' of to-day are simply the latest manifestations of that continuing life of the Church which must of necessity reach out to all mankind, and there is no essential difference between the *ecclesia* in England and the *ecclesia* in China or India or Africa. Wherever Christians are, there is the Church, 'the Body of Christ', the family of God 'out of every nation, and of all tribes and peoples and tongues'.

It follows that those who have this vision can never regard as adequate those attenuated conceptions of the Church that equate it with one denomination, or with one school of theological thought, or that regard it as a mere vehicle of expression for social reformers. The need of the hour is for a deepened sense of churchmanship, a renewed emphasis upon the Church as the redeemed community, united in Christ which shows forth His Spirit and continues His work in the world.

Can modern Methodism give this witness? Our Standing Orders declare: 'The Methodist Church claims and cherishes its place in the holy Catholic Church, which is the Body of Christ'. In these days of a collapsing world order, can we as Methodists take our share in proclaiming the Universal Church, the nucleus of the only world order that can endure?

H. S. F. ROSSITER

THE THEOLOGY OF POLITICS¹

DR. N. MICKLEM modestly demonstrates the influence of theology upon political thought to be a vital study, intimately relevant to the present crisis. Though not a theological treatise, his recent book maintains the thesis: that every political problem is at bottom theological, and that no political doctrine has prevailing power unless it be allied to a religion or pseudo-religion of some sort. It fully appreciates a *philosophia perennis*, a body of wisdom at the background of Western civilization derived from Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas. And it claims to be strictly rational: to owe its conception of man, society and the State 'as much to Hellenism as to any distinctively Christian source'. It recalls historic landmarks: that to Athens belongs the first notable experiment in democracy though its society rested upon slavery; that Aristotle taught that man is naturally a social being and that the State was founded and sustained that men might live happily; and that 'the ideal of a free society for free men' did not emerge until Christianity avowed the individual worth of man, irrespective of race or caste.

Dr. Micklem carefully expounds his thesis in a collection of homogeneous essays. He sifts and evaluates significant data and enriches his study with a wealth of select quotation. He shows that theologians of the calibre of St. Thomas Aquinas, Luther and Calvin have influenced political thought not less than Hobbes and Rousseau, and that politics and theology are 'wedded beyond the hope of a divorce'. His concern is with an 'articulated philosophy' more rational and more humane than that

phy, by which either Fascism or Communism offers: the Soviets stand for a 'material conception' of history, the Nazis for a 'racial'. Both suggest a 'militant atheism' and tyranny, the Nazis particularly, over soul and body. Nor can the energy of their pseudo-religious zeal be ignored, with its power to inspire the will to serve, and even to idealize their ideals. He holds that Karl Marx's analysis of our economic ills remains, and 'so far from being an answer to Bolshevism is almost an excuse for it, that indeed Mission capitalistic individualism stands condemned. This diagnosis should disturb however the placidity if we but reflect on the great European example of Communism as a complete to ever and logical working model' of Capitalism.

All this but emphasizes Dr. Micklem's aim to indicate the outlines of a doctrine of society, apprehended as the will of God revealed in Jesus Christ, which is at once an appeal to the reason and conscience of civilized men and an effective answer to Marxist materialism and Nazi racialism'. He sees in Totalitarianism a philosophy of despair even though it be decked, as in modern Germany, in a garb of romance. Incompatible with personal liberty it discards moral and religious sanctions and inevitably enslaves. We have but to compare the voluntary spirit of freedom with the coercive methods of Nazism to appreciate the validity of Dr. Micklem's thesis. Our very intolerance of slavery is due to the Christian religion and he boldly affirms that apart from the Christian faith there is no security for freedom.

Then, too, he stresses the fundamental principle of the alleged rights of man: that duties and rights are inseparable, that there are human rights only because there are human duties. Thus political liberty implies the duty of serving others, and in respecting their liberties too. Nor is liberty incompatible with order in the State. Burke insists that it is not only consistent with order and virtue but cannot exist without them. He avows it to be 'the substance and vital principle of good government'.

Convinced that we have suffered from a false philosophy of the State, Dr. Micklem deems it imperative to be clear about the principles that should govern society after the war. He sees the menace due to the concentration of immense wealth in the hands of a few and is keenly critical of 'the dehumanizing of modern life in the operations of joint stock companies limited in respect of liability but not of dividends'. He feels that industry but incidentally serves the common good, is mainly organized for private profit, and is often inimical to the rights and dignity of human personality. Other social problems are also discussed with insight and moral fervour. A discerning essay on 'An Ethical Dilemma' clarifies the problem of the Christian pacifist.

What the war has again made vivid is the simple fact that in this world there can be 'no absolute and unqualified possession of material things'. Until this is clearly recognized pre-war evils will haunt post-war society and the sinister shears of self-interest will continue to cut across the human. Two movements persistently contend: the one towards economic dictatorship, the other towards nationalization; and the claims of the latter quite naturally gain great stimulus under war conditions. To end this subtle 'class war' among ourselves it is necessary for all engaged in industry to explore the possibilities of real partnership in national service. Questions of a planned economy in the interests of the common good, a living wage, the representation of operatives on governing boards, service not gain as the dominant motive will then be amicably adjusted and, it may be, even established in a land rendered more fit for heroes to live in. The conviction that all these are at bottom religious problems is supported by Archbishop Temple in unambiguous terms: 'We shall not succeed in subordinating the economic to the truly human unless we subordinate the human to the divine'.

Colonial and international affairs are not less clearly surveyed. The world is faced with revolutionary changes: 'Individualism is dead; some sort of Collectivism there must be', especially in relation to colonial trade and finance. Foreign politics have

long proved a source of international enmity; yet the different nations of the world are more or less bound together by virtue of their 'physical and spiritual needs'. It is noted, without complacency, that the British Empire now honours the principle that 'the Power that "possesses" colonies must exercise authority in the interests of the natives and with the benevolence of a conscientious trustee'. But even benevolent trusteeship may not be entirely satisfactory, as in the case of India, many of whose pundits deem the time more than ripe for self-government. But self-government is not inconsistent with the rights of the community of nations as the British Commonwealth of Nations amply demonstrates. A respect for the Rights of Man is, however, indispensable.

This stands in vivid contrast to the Nazi ideal. Were the Nazis to win the war their victims would be enslaved. But their brutal disregard for the sanctity of human life already reacts in a livelier reverence for the rights of every man, Jew or Gentile, black or white, bond or free. Here we see the ironic futility of Adolf Hitler's dream to confine citizenship to pure-blooded Germans and to eliminate all non-Aryans from the body politic. Lord Acton's words were never more relevant than to the present crisis: 'A State which is incompetent to satisfy different races condemns itself. A State which labours to neutralize, to absorb, or excel them destroys its own vitality. A State which does not include them is destitute of the chief basis of self-government. The theory of nationality, pure and simple, is a retrograde step in history.' These views are endorsed in a comprehensive statement of principles and ideals: 'International control is only possible on the basis of common ideals and common moral principles . . . without a common ethic and a common doctrine of man there can be no world-society'.

Other important truths need also to be enforced if we are to rid the world of the Nazi contamination. Whoever would establish an international order must always have in mind that we live in a world in which 'each part is related to the whole'. Dr. Micklem rightly insists that this fact must govern all our efforts. And he adds a still more vital word: that there can be 'no absolute sovereignty over either people or things or nations. Only God is sovereign. All human authority derives from Him and is therefore subject to moral law.' Any nation that ignores this truth will be balked and baffled and defeated. The freedom of man's spirit must be honoured if we are to build a new and permanent order; for the structure of human society can never be reared unless built on the foundations of justice, truth, liberty and humanity. For this reason Herr Hitler's new order can never be established. He ignores God and the eternal laws and outrages the dignity of man. He has scrapped the vital values.

The war's bitter lessons explain the Atlantic Charter. This historic document is a noble conception, the aim of courageous statesmen to establish a community of nations. It seeks to create a higher international conscience; to make Peace secure by creating social conditions which provide an incentive to peace. Incidentally it attests the soundness of Dr. Micklem's thesis. It is an appeal to reverence the moral and spiritual dignity of man and it exposes the sin and futility of aggression. It says in effect: Wherever men, communities, or nations are bent on gratifying their selfish ambitions they dislocate sound human relationships, at home and abroad, and make their fellows the sport of their cruelty and their greed. It warns all nations that whatever temporary advantage a disregard of the rights of man may gain will but react upon offenders, whoever they may be. Its lofty ideals proclaim the advance-guard of Democracy. To make it operative should be the paramount aim of all peace-loving nations. The Atlantic Charter may yet prove the prelude to a World Charter.

One thing is clear: that man cannot live by bread alone. Our very problems but emphasize this truth and give point to the persistent calls for a better world. They, too, insist that whatever obscures the spiritual outlook assuredly leads to a false

the world attitude to life. What, then, is to be the attitude of the Christian Church to the formidable needs'. Is able legacy awaiting the post-war world?

The Pope's New Order, endorsed by Anglican and Free Church leaders, is a call to a new spiritual crusade and may offer opportunities of more concerted action. Unity is the order of the day; yet unity of purpose does not necessarily mean uniformity of expression. But it must be recognized that any new crusade has implications beyond the range of the traditional revival, though its work will be essentially evangelical. Amid the ramifications of modern society man has still an immortal longing. In this vale of soul-making, he yearns to realize his true personality, to fulfil his destiny in God. And we must take the trouble to understand the conditions that make man sceptical, the fetters that induce despair, the temptations that cloud his spiritual vision. To diagnose the present situation is necessary if we are to win the pass to the citadel of the soul. But we must begin at home. We need to cleanse and to re-energize the springs of Christian society. And we need to be more practical and more intelligent; to foster and to co-ordinate the Christian education of children and adults and to apply the Christian ethic to the solution of our social and economic problems. Our task is difficult but not beyond our resources. The world awaits the guidance and the inspiration of our Lord. He is still the Redeemer of man, the Hope of the world. If we truly serve Him He will use His Church as the instrument of His redemptive purpose. His Spirit will leaven society and create a new and better world. The Kingdom of God is *within*. We are called to witness to the Kingdom of God.

B. AQUILA BARBER

A LAST HOUR

THE first letter of St. John was written that we may know. In it he definitely states that truth repeatedly. No less than thirty times does 'know' occur in that brief letter. Among the things we shall know is the final statement that we shall know even what seems unknowable—"know that it is a last hour".

And because 'little children' in the faith are to know this, it cannot be some tragic or terrible happening, but a blessed hope and glorious appearing. In order to know that it is a last hour, St. John refers his readers to their previous knowledge: 'Ye heard that antichrist cometh, even now hath there arisen many antichrists; whereby we know that it is a last hour'. Antichrist is a person or thing fighting against the Reign of Christ in the world.

From the time of the prophets to that of St. John, the Scriptures abound in references to what are called, 'the Last Things', 'Last Days', 'Last Times', 'Last Trumpet'. The Bible can look at these things as no other book can! It is not fearful of them.

The end of the age is ever coming. Do we not to-day speak of the terrible experiences through which the whole world is passing as 'the end of an age'? When reading the Bible we can tell repeatedly that the writers ever felt themselves on the verge of the end of all things. And when St. John wrote his First Epistle it is obvious that the people felt that things could not go on much longer. The whole thought and language are full of a great and momentous crisis and startling change. Do not all of us experience that same mood to-day?

From the time of Daniel there had been great and terrible persecutions; but not on such a widespread and tragic scale as those by Germany to-day. The Jews had their darkest days—a last hour for them. Their leaders and seers buoyed them up with the thought that the darker the night, the nearer the dawn. Hence in the two hundred years before Christ there arose a whole literature of Pictured Apocalypses of coming victory. They had, as in Daniel, the fearful Monster of Evil—

the antichrist that always appeared before the end. But in the darkest hour they always had the hope of a Divine Deliverance. God's Messiah was to come, with all His holy angels—messengers—to judge the nations and to reign in Jerusalem. All the figures of thrones, trumpets and clouds, which we find everywhere in the New Testament, are taken from such books as the Book of Enoch.

And underneath it all was the great eternal truth that the Lord will come, the Lord does come, the Lord is always coming: the darkest hour heralds His coming. The many antichrists only prove that He is near at hand. Jesus Himself said, 'When these things begin to come to pass, look up and lift up your heads; because your redemption draweth nigh'. What were the things that were to come to pass? The answer might have been written for this very hour: 'Distress of nations: men in perplexity, fainting for fear, and for expectation of the things which were coming on the world'.

There are two rules for the guidance of all such Bible-study. If we do not keep them in mind, we shall go wildly astray in our deductions from such passages.

The first is that of Receding Horizons. The nearer we get to a desired, distant object, the further off it seems. As we climb a mountain, peak after peak appears; but they are not the summit. And as we climb the heights of history, the Great Day is far ahead. The thing is bigger than ever it seemed before. The great blunder that so many people have made in their definite statements concerning the immediate return of our Lord is that they have mistaken a peak for the summit, a crisis for the consummation, the end of an age for the end of all things. They are uninfluenced by the fact of receding horizons.

The second rule we must remember is The Fact of Unforeseen Fulfilment. History is ever giving to us the Great Crisis in Miniature. The Day of Judgement is always here; and prophecy is ever thus being fulfilled, unexpectedly, partially, yet typically of the greater fulfilments yet to come. In the days of Antiochus, when the Abomination of Desolation was set up in the Temple in Jerusalem, it was a last hour, and then God's heroes, the Maccabean Kings, came and swept it all away. When the dark hour of Israel's Bondage came, and the Herods were crushing life and hope out of the people, the star appeared and the angels sang. When the Lord of Glory was crucified, it was immediately followed by a Glorious Resurrection and a Pentecost of Power. When the end of Judaism—Ritualism—came, and Jerusalem was destroyed so that not one stone was left upon another, then the Son of Man filled His Church with Divine Power and Glory. And now, at the end of another century, St. John was obviously expecting Another Day, for the night was far spent. He is quite sure that the last hour is advanced because the night is so black, and enemies are so strong.

It must be so: it is always so. And that ever-repeating fact has been proceeding ever since. And now after another such, but much worse period, the very worst the world has ever seen, when all sorts of antichrists are abroad, 'deceiving the very elect', we know, hereby we know it is a last hour. Christ is at hand. Are we ready for Him? 'Behold the Bridegroom cometh! Are we ready to go forth and acclaim Him?

Dark, so dark are these days. The Man of Sin has literally dashed on to the stage of life like an exaggerated, howling Dervish. He and his flamboyant followers deny the authority of the Living Christ, and are strenuously trying to thrust Him from His rightful throne. The most obsessed of his followers have actually acclaimed him as the true Messiah, the final revelation of God. What a terrifying picture of God is conjured up when we almost hear Adolf Hitler saying to the world, 'He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father'. What a Father!!!

It is very difficult to define what theologians mean by the term 'Original Sin'. The literal interpretation of the Garden of Eden transgression—death and woe resulting from eating a forbidden apple seems an extreme penalty for such an action—leads

to mental confusion; but if we see in that ancient story man's earliest attempt to explain the presence and cause of a tragic world phenomenon—sin—we shall avoid many conclusions which are irreconcilable with the Revelation of God in Christ. Christ alone enables us to affirm that no evil had its origin in God. St. Paul was right when he affirmed 'Since by man came death'—separation from God. God is a God of Life, not of death: of righteousness, not of sin. Misinterpretation of world phenomena has resulted in such distortions as the immaculate conception with its consequent reflections on human nature as created by God.

If we adhere to the primal meaning of 'original', one can assert that there is nothing original in Nazi abominable crimes against humanity. Its vilest transgressions can be paralleled many times in history. It has only copied many past inhumanities. It has, however, a claim to being unique in that it has devilishly magnified what we, when in nightmareland, have thought to be hell let loose in God's beautiful world. The Nazi cult is like a mad dog furiously attacking a flock of frightened sheep, and slaying without purpose. To affirm that the present German Reich has returned to the Law of the Jungle is an insult to the Jungle. There is nothing like it to be found there. It is more reminiscent of our Lord's parable of the unclean spirit going out of a man and leaving the personality tenantless. The unclean spirit returned, and finding it unoccupied, fetched seven other devils worse than the first, and forced an entrance. As we look at the Nazi atrocities we feel that the number of new entrants must be multiplied by at least seventy times seven. Hitler and his confreres have out-Heroded Herod.

Can there be any compromise or negotiation with them? God is surely summoning His whole Church, not merely one section of it, to a Holy Crusade against the Men of Sin; and no single disciple of His can claim immunity from his or her part in the fight on the ground that he or she is a pacifist. When light comes into conflict with darkness, light does not negotiate with its antagonist: it says imperatively, 'Out of the way of the sun'!

But we must not forget, even when in the thickest of the fight, that even for Hitler and his worst companions, Christ died. 'And that He died for all' was the sentence St. Paul linked to 'The Love of Christ constraineth us because we thus judge'. That conviction will not enfeeble resistance; but it will enable us to keep on Truthing it in love. The true disciples of Jesus Christ are not afraid of death, sweat, toil and anguish; but all of them are unalterably resolved that at all costs to themselves The Truth shall be King of the whole world, and not an inflated and vain ranter who claims to be the greatest German ever known to history. That claim would be humorous if it were not so tragic; for when the man's ancestry is examined his claim to be a 'pure German' is another lie.

We are enheartened when we remember God's law of Light after Darkness. It is always darkest before the dawn. 'While we were yet sinners Christ died for us.' We were cold, dead, inert stones; but we were lifted into the Living Temple: to the needy Christ came, and not to what we judge to be the worthy. Out of chaos God made creation—kosmos, order. That is God's method of working. When Paul cried, 'O wretched man that I am', the glorious 'Thanks be to God' sprang up in his heart.

We need not fear a last hour when our allegiance is to men and things that make for the Reign of Christ. Then antichrist—men and things opposed to that reign—deepens that allegiance, and makes us willing to go to the Cross with Christ for the world's redemption.

But what of the day when victory shall dawn for Justice, Kindness, Truth and all those qualities which make for righteousness? That victory is certain, for evil, and the vilest evil even more abundantly, carries in its heart the seeds of its own destruction. When we hear the piercing words, 'Let him that is without sin cast the first

stone', the hand raised to strike falls instinctively, and we feel unable to attack the sinister foes of mankind.

Then what justification have we to answer the summons of Christ to join the ranks of His Crusaders? What is the distinction between the good and the bad man? Is the good man the perfect man? Not by any means. Goodness and badness are a matter of direction. Are our feet on the mountain, and our eyes looking towards the summit—the goal of all our hopes, aspirations and strivings? If so, in the Bible meaning of the word we are among the elect of God—those who have answered God's call, and gone out in search of the Holy Grail. If our backs are towards God, and we have started on the downward track of the mountain, no matter at what height we may be, we have become, by the very fact of that reversed movement of the spirit, enemies of God and man.

We can be actively against God by being passively indifferent to the evils about us. What terrible evils we have tolerated in our own country, and feel unmoved by the dire consequences of that indifference! We have only to think of slums, which we have complacently tolerated for years, and all must feel condemned. The greatest condemnation of slumdom is that we have yet to hear of a poet or artist who was born, reared and died amid the horrors and depressing limitations of that living death. Privilege and vested interests have victoriously fought against the demand for equal opportunities for all. And our country is woefully poorer because we have refused to provide justice for all children. The cost of genuine social service is the most profitable investment any state can make. To close one's eyes to those obvious obligations is to become guilty of wicked waste of human material.

But there are inspiring signs that the dawn is breaking. The best men of the present day are resolved that the world shall be more free, and that the instincts for Justice, Liberty, Fraternity shall be answered. The noble Atlantic Declaration by President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill, which includes the pledge that the new age shall be liberated from ancient evils, makes us hopeful that we shall take at least one motto from the much abused, misunderstood and often grossly misrepresented Soviet Russia: 'All for each and each for all'. Is not that the Christian Way? It was what the Pentecostal Church instinctively initiated. When that was pointed out to an ardent advocate of competition, he at once retorted, 'But they soon had to jettison it: that is proof that it is unworkable in practice'. He was wrong in his deduction. Instead of demonstrating that universal co-operation is unworkable, and that competition is the best economic system, *it proved that the instincts of the first Christian Church were centuries in advance of their intelligence.*

We must all prepare ourselves for an even greater struggle after victory over vile, bestial and unclean forces is won—the struggle against privilege and vested interests, which make impossible the fulfilment of the second greatest commandment, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour *as thyself*'. When we love our neighbour as much as we love ourselves, there is no need to say, 'Thou shalt not steal: Thou shalt not cheat: Thou shalt not profiteer: Thou shalt not employ sweated labour: Thou shalt not charge excessive rent: Thou shalt not tolerate unhealthy accommodation for tenants'. But this new age will only begin when we really enthrone Jesus Christ as Lord of our life. We shall then be prepared to greet the Saviour of Mankind with:

'Hail Saviour, Prince of Peace!
Thy kingdom shall increase
Till all the world Thy glory see,
And righteousness abound
As the great deep profound,
And fill the earth with purity'.

J. BREEDEN

Editorial Comments

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP

The Spens Report on Secondary Education asserts that religious instruction 'should be as well taught and effectively planned as any other branch of study'. This does not seem an extravagant claim to make in a country whose educational system is supposed to be established on Christian foundations. Few people, however, can be satisfied with the present situation. In spite of excellent work in the provision of agreed syllabuses, and in the arrangement of special courses in Training Colleges, the main problem is still unsolved. So long as the teachers and the Churches remain estranged the position will continue to be unsatisfactory. Only by mutual co-operation and understanding can the solution be found. That there is such a solution is certain, but it will not be obtained by hurried legislation or one-sided regulations. The matter is so urgent that one cannot risk short cuts. The first necessity appears to be a frank exchange of opinion between representatives of the teachers and the Churches.

In an admirable booklet by Sir Walter Moberley, D.S.O., M.A., Chairman of the Education Committee of the National Society, the case for such discussions is made plain. First the ground must be cleared of misunderstandings, and both clergy and teachers become familiar with each other's point of view. Teachers are often exasperated by clerical criticism and strongly resentful of 'tests'. Naturally enough, they refuse to accept responsibility for the frequent failure of religious education to exert a permanent influence. 'They may fairly plead that they have been set an impossible task, in being asked to give religious education within a community that is not itself religious', says Sir Walter. This must obviously be recognized by the Churches, for it would be unreasonable to discuss the problem of the school without relating it to the home and to social conditions generally. In considering 'religious education' we must be careful to define our use of the term. It may mean the teaching of Scripture in an 'objective and neutral' sense, acknowledging the teaching of the Bible to be as much part of a liberal education as is the teaching of Shakespeare. This would be generally approved by teachers, Sir Walter Moberley thinks, but it is, of course, a very unsatisfactory minimum. It is the desire of the Churches to establish Christian values in national life, and therefore in our educational system. This leads naturally to a further development of the term 'religious education' as implying faith in God and faith in Christ. 'Either belief in God is a pernicious delusion or God matters more than any other fact in human experience. . . . May the schools train children in an allegiance to Jesus Christ, not only as an inspiring teacher but as their Saviour and their living Lord and Master?' This point, Sir Walter feels, is crucial.

It is here that the contact between representatives of the schools and of the Churches is so essential. No scheme of religious education, in this sense, can have any hope of success if it be issued as an order to be carried out by uninterested, ill-equipped or hostile teachers. Mathematics cannot be taught satisfactorily by a man who does not believe in mathematical principles, nor even by one who thinks them of little value in the practical business of living! It seems, then, that the problem of religious education, in any full use of the term, can only be solved by winning not only the approval but the passionate devotion of at least a proportion of the teaching community! It is here that the Churches must give a definite lead, without arrogance

or any sense of superiority but also without any trace of fear or any suggestion of denominational interest.

It is glibly said that there is no leadership to-day in the Christian Church. This is a stupid generalization which is not true to fact. In Norway the resignation of Bishop Berggrav and now of the whole of the Norwegian clergy as a protest against Nazi tyranny is a magnificent repudiation of such a statement. The recent words of Einstein, exiled in America, are further proof: 'Having been an ardent partisan of freedom,' he says, 'I turned to the universities as soon as the revolution broke out in Germany, to find there defenders of freedom. I did not find them. Very soon the universities took refuge in silence. I turned to the editors of powerful newspapers, who, but lately in flowing articles, had claimed to be faithful champions of liberty. These men, as well as the universities, were reduced to silence in a few weeks. I then addressed myself to the authors, individually to those who passed themselves off as the intellectual guides of Germany, and among whom many had frequently discussed the question of freedom and its place in modern life. They in turn were dumb. Only the Church opposed the fight which Hitler was waging against liberty. Till then I had no interest in the Church, but now I feel great admiration and am truly attracted to the Church, which has had the persistent courage to fight for spiritual truth and moral freedom. I feel obliged to recognize that I now admire what I used to consider of little value.' In such a confession there is evidence of the influence of the Christian minority in this war-torn world.

The Malvern Conference was, in England, a significant sign of the new sense of urgency and of opportunity which is making itself manifest.

At the request of the Commission of the Churches for International Friendship and Social Responsibility a letter was written by the chairman, Dr. Temple, conveying greetings to fellow Christians in all countries. It contained this passage: 'However deeply we may be divided in our judgements about this war, we are united in the recognition that a world in which such things happen is far from obedience to the mind of Christ; and we are united with you in calling ourselves and all men to the foot of His Cross, where alone the word of pardon is spoken and men are reconciled to God and to one another'.

There are certainly signs of an awakening, and it is at such a moment that this opportunity for advancing the cause of religious education has come. The Churches can do a great deal by making friendly contact with Teachers, Education Authorities, Parents' Associations and the Board of Education, and by the frank discussion of policies may make possible not only Christian teaching but 'schools pervaded in all their activities by a Christian spirit'. That should be the goal of Christian leadership, and Sir Walter Moberley, in his pamphlet, *The Churches and the Teachers*, has shown the possibility of definite advance towards it.

YOUTH MOVEMENTS

A popular American philosopher once said: 'All you owe your children is to equip them properly for life. You owe them that they be born with sound, undiseased bodies; that they be trained in habits that keep one healthy. You owe them such an education as shall put at their service the accumulated knowledge of the world. You owe them a thorough grounding in moral principles. You owe them your loyal love and friendship. That is all. You do not owe them any money. . . . Giving an inheritance of money to one's child is a lazy way of avoiding the hard work of giving him character and life-equipment.' Those words were written before the war. They are not a complete description of our debt—still less of our opportunity—but they do remove the emphasis from finance and place it on the formation of character.

In a world at war, youth is offered a false standard of values. The removal of parental restraint, the concentration of energy on the production of weapons of destruction, the offer of relatively higher wages, the interruption of educational programmes, the emotional strain and nervous tension of actual raids or threatened invasion, the limitation of food supplies, evacuation with its quickly changing circumstances—these are some of the causes which deprive youth of its proper heritage. Under such conditions one of the first obligations of Christian citizenship is to devise means of guiding and protecting the development of boys and girls in their formative years. Schemes which provide for physical and vocational training are not enough. Character-building is a dismal failure if spiritual values are ignored or denied.

On March 3rd all German radio stations broadcast the following statement by an official spokesman of the Reich: 'Every one is complaining of the disgusting behaviour of our boys and girls. Even maimed officers complain that the lads do not respect them. Evidence of the brutality in the hearts of our youth is accumulating. Our youth displays insolence instead of pride—slovenliness instead of steadfastness. The war is disintegrating their morality. We appeal to every one to help, for if our youth has lost its humility, it is lost altogether.' So much for the Youth Movement of Nazi Germany! Its gospel of physical fitness in the interests of an arrogant and exclusive nationalism was doomed to failure. It may return, like the boomerang, and destroy its creators.

In our own case there is considerable danger that well-meaning people may unconsciously make a similar mistake. The Youth Movement in Britain is largely shaped by local authorities. Unless the Christian element in the community is alive to the situation the vital element may be missing. There must be spiritual purpose in all our planning. No question of financial aid must tempt the Church to relegate this to a place in the background. Nor must the effort to adapt existing organizations lead to any attempt at the regimentation of youth. There will be no such temptation if the Churches realize that this is one of the most serious problems before them. To appoint a casual committee as though one were about to plan a Sunday school treat is to court failure. The formation and conduct of a Youth Centre may mean the reorganization of many of the existing activities, but it may also mean the salving of a generation. The problem demands unceasing prayer and the closest sustained consideration.

In some areas one has discovered the chief concern to be the attendance of the local boys and girls at a public hall where 'dancing to a modern orchestra' was the chief attraction, with the possible addition of 'free refreshments'. This kind of invitation is a travesty of what should be the rescue of youth from the maelstrom which has engulfed the rest of us. Many people, however, are beginning to realize the urgency of the problem and to give themselves enthusiastically to its solution.

Here is an interesting report from the Discussion Group of the Forest Hill and Sydenham Rotary Club. Its recommendations are open to criticism, but it certainly commands respect for its vision, its courage and its sincerity.

WE DESIRE

Equality of opportunity for all children to develop their potentialities to the fullest.

WE BELIEVE

This is only possible by removing handicaps of lowly birth and poverty; and eliminating economic considerations by standardizing incomes for all children up to 18 years of age.

WE RECOMMEND

1. Immediate introduction of a Ten Years' Plan to consolidate all existing Educational Establishments into one complete National Scheme. Private Enterprise in education to be illegal.
2. Nursery Schools optional up to 5 years of age.
3. Compulsory Education Period from 5-18 years for every child.
4. From 5-12 (or earlier mental equivalent) only one method of education for all children, designed to develop a zest for life and initiative and service to the community, with entire freedom from competitive examinations.
5. The County Badge Scheme to be compulsory for all round development of character.
6. At 12 years of age (or earlier mental equivalent) each child to be considered by a Vocational Advisory Committee comprising a Government Vocational Officer and two Business or Professional men (unpaid).

Parents to convey to the V.A.C. their preferences, hopes and ambitions as to the child's career.

Schoolmasters to report on child's aptitudes and express aspirations.

Vocational Advisory Committee to 'approve' child for a particular line of study—their decision being final.

7. From 12-15 years curricula to vary according to type, under three main headings, suitably subdivided.

(a) Manual; (b) Technical; (c) Academic.

8. From 15-16 years State to pay every child 12s. 6d. week.

,, 16-17	"	"	"	15s.	"
,, 17-18	"	"	"	20s.	"

(Payment direct to any young person (under 18) for services rendered to be illegal).

9. (a). At 15 years, manual type may leave school altogether and be placed in factory or ship—the employers re-imburasing the State for the subsistence allowance paid.

(b) At 15 years, technical type may commence part-time work, the employers re-imburasing the State *pro rata*—Students attending classes three afternoons and three evenings weekly.

(c) After 15 years, academic type to continue at their studies at public expense or *as long as necessary* in the opinion of the Vocational Advisory Committee who would be required to invest the country's money in its youth.

10. Religious Education to be compulsory. By qualified and willing teachers. Christian principles only. No doctrine of any particular sect.

11. Compulsory School Camps annually for every child certified medically fit. School holidays staggered to facilitate this.

12. Labour Camps compulsory at 15 years of age for three months' duration.

This carefully considered document is the report of a number of business men who are united by bonds of service and are facing the problems of post-war reconstruction with a very real sense of duty. One of the chief points for criticism, we feel, is that it takes so much responsibility and privilege from the home and transfers it to the State. It is, however, a pattern and a challenge. The future of our children is not the concern only of specialists or politicians; it is the business of us all. The Church must see it as its most important and immediate task.

BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES

duc-
ise in

for all
com-
nt of
dered
fficer
o the

dy—
head-

gal).
d in
ance

yers
three

ense
ould

ers.

fit.

who
on
at it
ate.
ern
e it

It is constantly being affirmed that the preliminary shaping of the post-war world will be undertaken by America, Britain, China and Russia. This assumption is rather too easily adopted. Even the terminology—America, Britain, China and Russia—is loose, though one supposes it is chosen so that A.B.C.R. may be a convenient abbreviation. It is, however, quite clear that the preliminary stages of any re-planning of world-order can only be successful if there be co-operation between the members of the partnership, and such co-operation depends on mutual understanding and sympathy. The average Briton has still only a hazy view of the people and problems of China and Russia, but it is astonishing that this same vagueness should characterize his conception of the citizens of the United States. The future of mankind may be largely determined by the measure of intelligent and intimate association of the two great English-speaking peoples.

The insularity of the Englishman is notorious but the American is not entirely blameless. A few weeks ago we travelled in the train with a number of officers of the United States army. The journey was pleasant, and there appeared to be no sense of embarrassment or restraint. When the train reached an important station, the Americans prepared to leave. One of them remarked quite pleasantly but quite seriously: 'Well, remember boys, from now on we're foreigners in this place'. How far that was due to some preconceived idea of English 'isolationism' or to the speaker's own attitude it would be difficult to say, but it is certain that every effort must be made to end such misconceptions. Circumstances, if not adversity, are bringing about new intimacies. It would be tragic indeed if they became only the temporary result of crisis. In 1796 George Washington said in his farewell address to the people of the United States, 'It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world'. It is interesting to compare this with Abraham Lincoln's statement, 'I claim not to have controlled events, but confess plainly that events have controlled me'. These words, written in a letter to A. G. Hodges, are, in some ways, descriptive of the position of Britons and Americans to-day. Isolationism, whether of the political body or of the individual citizen, is no longer possible. Stern necessity has forced us into a new intimacy. It would be a calamity if it remained only the co-operation of armed forces in the interest of self-preservation. If the democracies are indeed to be united to preserve principles of freedom and justice for mankind as a whole, they must draw nearer to one another in mutual respect and understanding. The inevitable internationalism of to-morrow cannot become reality whilst blood-relations stand ignorantly, indifferently or deliberately apart.

It would seem that America, 'half-brother of the world', has a great part to play in this new stage of human progress. Years ago Israel Zangwill wrote, in a play that became famous: 'America is God's crucible, the great Melting-Pot where all the races of Europe are melting and reforming! . . . God is making the American'. So many peoples have been blended to form one great nation and, surely by a watchful Providence, they have been brought towards solidarity for 'such a time as this'. The very fact of their diversity seems to mark them out for membership in a new federation which shall presently embrace not only Europe but the world at large.

One of the vital factors in such future development will be the closer relationship of the British Commonwealth with the United States. If this new approach is to be permanent it will have to be based on an understanding of those fundamentals which both peoples have in common. Misconceptions will have to be removed, and some popular judgements openly reversed. On our part we must no longer imagine that the people of the United States are accurately portrayed by what Willard Connely calls 'the crimes magnified by journalism or the pranks elaborated by the

cinema'. We may smile at the kindly humour of Mr. Dooley: " 'Th' American nation in th' Sixth Ward is a fine people,' he says. 'They love th' eagle, on th' back iv a dollar'." But though we permit ourselves a smile we must not be satisfied until we have discovered beneath an apparent materialism those spiritual forces which have produced the idealism that even the stern necessities of war will not quench. In a discerning diagnosis of the present position Miss Vera Brittain has said: 'We fail to understand the spiritual and emotional nature of America's unlimited aspiration because it is largely expressed in material things. In the United States I am continually reminded of Shelley's phrase, "The yearning for something afar". If we knew what lay behind the desire to build skyscrapers, we should understand American psychology better'. She suggests that the lofty buildings and 'the little dusty villages in Georgia which attach the word "City" to their insignificant names' are symptoms of America's unlimited faith in the future.

We share such a faith, and to-morrow, together, we might help to build, not houses made with hands, but the city of God.

There are many misconceptions which we must correct. The idea that American culture is superficial is not true to-day. Her educational system has much from which we might learn. Her history is of tremendous importance and can no longer be dismissed as an easy, secondary subject only selected by the student who is anxious to avoid more 'classical' research. More important still is the urgent need of exploring the deep spiritual principles on which all that is best in the two nations is built, and for which both peoples may unite their common endeavour. 'Civilization must be based on some religious tendency,' says Professor Saurat. 'We have fallen into the trap of thinking that a civilization could be maintained without religion.' Amidst all the trials of war we in Britain, and they in America, are keeping alive what George Washington called 'that little spark of celestial fire called conscience'. We owe it to each other and to the world to cultivate that new friendship which has been born in adversity, but which may grow into the fullness of the divine purpose in the coming days of deliverance and peace. In the hearts of most British and American people Lincoln's words are echoed: 'I intend no modification of my oft-expressed personal wish that all men everywhere could be free'. The first step towards realization of that desire is that the two freest peoples in the world should unite in the closest bonds, and pledge themselves to the emancipation of mankind.

[To those who are interested in this subject we commend *Peace Aims Pamphlet No. 10* containing recent addresses by Denis Saurat, Señor S. de Madariaja, H. D. Liem, H. W. Brailsford, Barbara Ward, A. L. Goodhart, Vera Brittain, Willard Connely, George Catlin and Sir Arthur Eddington. Price 1s.]

LESLIE F. CHURCH

Ministers in Council

MANCHESTER DISTRICTS' MINISTERIAL ASSOCIATION. The Rev. T. Hacking forwards a programme of the tenth annual session of this Association to be held on Wednesday, June 3rd, at Mottram Hall, a large, early eighteenth-century mansion near Prestbury in Cheshire. The day is to begin with a devotional service in the chapel, attached to the hall, conducted by the President of the Association, the Rev. J. J. Gould. The Rev. R. M. Rutter is then to contribute an essay on 'Christian Experience', after which the Rev. W. M. Hoult, M.A., B.D., will introduce a conversation. In the

afternoon the theme entrusted to the Rev. R. W. Callin is 'The Presentation of the Christian Message to the New Paganism', and discussion will be opened by the Rev. T. H. Burnett.

A bibliography is appended which includes references to Schweitzer's *Decay and Restoration of Civilization* (Black), Greenwood's *Christianity and the Mechanists* (Eyre & Spottiswoode), and R. Palme Dutt's *Lenin* (Hamish Hamilton).

A circular letter is also being sent out explaining the genesis and purpose of Ministerial Associations. The secretary states that they were commenced in the Primitive Methodist Church for mental stimulus and serious study somewhere about eighty years ago. For the subjects, theological, philosophical and literary, taken at the spring and autumn meetings, each member was expected to prepare himself by careful reading. The associates themselves were essayists and critics. The completion of examinations on probation was not regarded as granting escape from the discipline of great books but rather as the introduction to the fellowship of those who loved all learning for its own sake. The *Holborn Review* (though at first under a different title) afforded opportunity for some of the papers read at those meetings to gain a wider circulation. From time to time the College tutors enriched the gatherings with their knowledge, given not only in written form, but, what was often more valuable, in the thought-traffic of animated discussion. The transition from the traditional to the critical view of the Bible was made in this way. It was at the request of a Ministerial Association that Dr. Peake sent to the *Holborn Review* his first contribution in 1891. This dealt with the Synoptic Problem and was the forerunner of many articles from his pen. But it was the charm of the Association that it was not the professor alone but equally also the hard-worked circuit minister who was found to have matter of weighty value to bring before his brethren as the result of personal study. Most Districts in the Connexion had a Ministerial Association.

Since Methodist Union the Manchester District Association has been doing an excellent work. The secretary records that in each of the past three years the average attendance has been fifty. An invitation is now being sent to other ministers who have recently entered the District to join in this happy and helpful fellowship.

* * * * *

FROM MINISTERS' FRATERNAL TO JOINT CONFERENCE WITH LAYMEN. At a recent Ministers' Fraternal, the possibilities of early Free Church organic union were canvassed, but without much enthusiasm. The question then arose as to the formation of a branch of the Free Church Federal Council. This, it was agreed, might be useful. But it was pressed that there was a prior need, namely, to secure informal fellowship for the lay leaders of the Nonconformist Churches. The spirit of a ministers' fraternal must, it was said, be got over to our laymen. The decision was accordingly taken to have a joint conference of ministers with a few laymen from each Baptist, Congregational and Methodist church of the locality.

On the night appointed, a goodly company, representative of most of the congregations in the town, assembled to discuss 'The Church and its Job'. A layman, the ex-town clerk, presided. Two laymen led off with a short paper or speech each, propounding their views on the topic of the evening. Ministers remained as much as possible in the background, merely interjecting a comment now and again, but for the greater part content to listen to what the man in the pew had to say concerning the man in the pulpit. Inevitably, however, some Methodist local preachers were present and these put forward queries arising out of their experiences.

A most notable feature of the two hours' session was the insistence—not on the call to action or organization, but on the paramount necessity for a clear-cut faith. Business and professional men pleaded for simple non-technical instruction in the essentials

of the Christian faith, in language understood of the people. How can we evangelize the masses—one of the jobs of the Church—it was asked, when we are not ourselves crystal sure what is the evangel? And one matter in particular, evidently occasioning concern amongst a number, was how to find and present a message for the moral man, good but not religious, whose behaviour also, it was affirmed, may often put to shame the average chapel member.

And so it was unanimously resolved to essay the urgent task in unison of seeking a clarification for Church workers of the Core of Christianity.

* * * * *

EDUCATIONAL CHANGES IN WAR-TIME. Strong forces are at present contending for legislative and administrative movement to reconstruct our national system of education and especially in relation to elementary day schools. Doubts, however, are being expressed as to the wisdom of attempting this in war-time.

On this aspect it is interesting and apposite to note the remarks of H. A. L. Fisher in his *Unfinished Autobiography* (Oxford University Press). He declares: 'The war was my opportunity. I was sensible from the first that while the war lasted reforms could be obtained and advances could be made which would be impossible to realize in the critical atmosphere of peace. I resolved to move forward at a hand-gallop and along the whole front. If I did not strike my blow now, the opportunity might be lost never to return.' First he dealt with the Cabinet. 'Very early in 1917 I submitted a memorandum to the Cabinet detailing the deficiencies in our public system of education and the appropriate remedies. My memorandum was short, dry, succinct, a catalogue of points. There were no flowers of speech. I knew that I had to deal with very busy men and that I should be lucky if I could obtain half an hour of Cabinet time. As a matter of fact my Education Report Cabinet was over in less than half an hour.' In that half-hour his proposals had been accepted in principle. Quick work!

The abolition of the half time system and the more adequate payment of teachers were among the reforms achieved under this urge, and for that and other items the country might well be grateful. As Herbert Ward records in his *Educational System of England and Wales and its Recent History* (Cambridge University Press): 'The Great War which stopped expansion of all kinds for the time, gave an extraordinary stimulus to popular interest in education. The scholars in all schools felt themselves to be partners with the whole nation in the long struggle, and both combatants and non-combatants cherished a determination that the next generation should have better chances than the generations that were fighting and suffering. . . . Mr. Fisher's Act of 1918 . . . was accepted, not as a set of detailed provisions . . . so much as a national gesture, as a declaration of rights and duties.'

But then Mr. Fisher had welcomed, indeed courted, publicity for his plans. He had devoted a summer recess to a campaign for explaining the provisions of his Bill and eliciting any objections. Everywhere he went throughout the country, the halls were packed with interested hearers. He relates: 'One of my most surprising occasions was a meeting of dockers, got together at a moment's notice by E. Bevin on a Sunday morning in the theatre at Bristol. I have never encountered such enthusiasm. They did what I have never seen before or since, rose to their feet two or three times in the course of my speech, waved their handkerchiefs and cheered themselves hoarse. The prospect of wider opportunities which the new plan for education might open to the disinherited filled them with enthusiasm.'

That method of publicity is in marked contrast with the recent issue of the much talked about Green Book outlining a drastic overhauling of our educational system and circulated under the signature of Sir Maurice G. Holmes as a confidential document. Mr. Butler, the new President of the Board of Education, will, it is hoped steadfastly resist such a policy of secrecy and equally set his face against any sub-

sidizing of sectarian privilege. The nation is ready now as in 1917-18 for genuine educational advance but would resent any attempt at denominational endowment under guise of war-time urgency.

* * * * *

'CHRISTIAN YOUTH LEADERSHIP.' Under this title the Rev. H. C. Warner, vicar of Epsom, has just published with the S.C.M. (2s. 6d.) a book of some hundred odd pages that follows admirably on *Youth in Action* which in 1939 he edited for the S.P.C.K. In six chapters he deals with The Present Situation, The Service of Youth and Local Authorities, Some Implications of Character Training, The Spiritual Basis for Youth Work, The Christian Background for Youth Work, and First Steps in the Christian Service of Youth. Seven appendices are added, including an account of an Experimental Youth Centre, War-time Jobs of Service for Youth, a classified Bibliography and a list of Topics for addresses to audiences of youth.

The main emphasis of the book is on character training. Stress also is laid on the importance of studying the welfare of youth in industry as well as having regard to the use of their leisure time. 'We tolerate', says Mr. Warner, 'a state of affairs where a boy or girl of fourteen, in the vast majority of cases, goes straight from the sheltered environment of school life into the utterly different adult world of industry, working alongside people of much maturer experience. Ways of thought and habits of speech which for an adult do little actual harm are poisonous to a mind of so tender an age. Yet the Service of Youth as a whole has so far done practically nothing about this disastrous state of affairs. Until the Christian conscience latent in the nation has been re-energized to examine life by personal, not impersonal, standards, these scandals of our modern social life are likely to continue through a spirit of sheer inertia.'

The book is most timely and helpful, and also no doubt the precursor of others which we are likely to have on this challenging turn of events in the nation's attitude to youth.

* * * * *

SPONTANEOUS OR DIRECTED DEVOTION. Dr. N. Micklem has raised in his *Prayers and Praises* (Hodder, 4s. 6d.) a searching interrogation as to the adequacy of spontaneous private prayer. He holds that the spiritual discipline required by the way of the Puritans (as instanced by a quotation from John Greenwood, one of the early Separatists of the sixteenth century) is much more exacting than the method of the Roman or Anglo-Catholics. He explains how he himself in earlier days had used the traditional offices of the Hours of Prime, Terce, Sext, None and Compline, but he had come to feel that, valuable as this use might in part have been, these forms were not fully congruous with evangelical life. He therefore has compiled a book of prayers and praises for Free Churchmen, prefaced by an address on The Christian Life, which takes as its text the old prayer *Anima Christi*, and concluded by a prayer with which Dr. Benjamin Whichcote, the Cambridge Platonist, led his congregation before his sermon. The little manual, the author believes, may help a reader to become independent of varying moods and may stir the soul to advance from its use to more spontaneous, more personal supplication and adoration.

Probably the most salutary fruit would be in leading many to follow the example of Dr. Micklem and become their own scribes. What Bible study suggests, what the Spirit inspires in seasons of close communion, what the circumstances of life demand, as well as what appears on questing among devotional classics, these may all conspire to lead to a private prayer book of inestimable worth catholic and yet stamped with individuality.

* * * * *

I shall be glad to receive further reports and also comments on any subject suitable for these columns.

W. E. FARNDALE

10 Mainwaring Road,
Lincoln

Recent Literature

Forgiveness and Reconciliation. By Dr. Vincent Taylor. (Macmillan, 10s. 6d.)

New Testament scholars, having given themselves for a generation to the examination of text, authorship, documents, and so on, are now turning their attention to New Testament theology. Not a few of them have reached the conclusion that in the first century there were not distinct Pauline, Johannine, Petrine and Synoptic theologies, but one theology, however variously the several writers may state it. Among these scholars Dr. Vincent Taylor is taking a leading place. Devoting himself, at least for the time being, to the great doctrine of the Work of Christ, he has now added a third volume to his two earlier works, *Jesus and His Sacrifice* and *The Atonement in New Testament Teaching*. He has entitled the third volume *Forgiveness and Reconciliation*, and in it, as its name implies, he devotes himself to the examination of what is called 'The Christian Experience', though he is careful to emphasize the truth that this experience does not exist *in vacuo*, but that it is the experience of *something*. In this volume he sufficiently recapitulates the findings of the other two to make it easy to read it by itself, but the three volumes, taken together, give a masterly and modern account of the whole doctrine of the Atonement, as found in the New Testament. It is modern, not in the sense that it despises the old, but in the better sense that the writer brings out of the New Testament treasure-house 'things new' as well as 'old'. It goes without saying that Dr. Taylor is master of the relevant literature, and that his work is patient, exact, lucid and complete. He has also his own contribution to make to the subject—or rather, his own contributions, for he makes several at various points. They fall under the head of the exact exposition of New Testament terms and passages. The old ways of classifying theories of the Atonement are now largely out of date, but Dr. Taylor's theory very closely falls under what used to be called 'objective' theories. Here, of course, he differs from a good many recent expositors.

Dr. Taylor arranges his discussion under the six terms 'Forgiveness', 'Justification', 'Reconciliation', 'Fellowship', 'Sanctification' and 'Atonement'. He is careful, however, to point out that these are not separable entities, but are rather different elements in one experience, each in turn being isolated only for purposes of study. Under each of the first five subjects there is a discriminating discussion of its 'place in modern theology'. These discussions are not the least valuable part of the book.

In the chapter on Forgiveness, after showing how Jesus dwelt more on men's forgiveness of one another than the Apostolic writers do, Dr. Taylor goes on to examine all the relevant evidence for the teaching of the New Testament on the subject and successfully shows that in it, as over against modern writers, Forgiveness is not to be equated with Justification and Reconciliation, but is rather their pre-requisite. Our author defines it as 'the removal or annulment of the obstacles in the way of reconciliation', but he adds that the only obstacles are 'sins'—that is, that they lie wholly in man and not in God. Here, as he notes, the Biblical phrase is 'the remission of sins'. It is regrettable that our English versions translate one Greek word sometimes by 'forgiveness' and sometimes by 'remission'. To a careful examination of the Greek word Dr. Taylor adds a section on the teaching of the Old Testament about Forgiveness. Here he quotes a doubtful statement from Oesterley and Robinson's book on *Hebrew Religion*: 'All sacrifices, whether bloodless or bloody, effect reconciliation'. The only reference that these writers give is Ezekiel xlv. 15, 17, and it is by no means certain that Judaism took over all Ezekiel's ideas. But a more important question arises in this chapter. Is it true that in the New Testament Forgiveness is 'only indirectly associated with the death of Christ'? It is likely, as

Dr. Taylor says, that in Matthew's text, 'This is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many unto remission of sins', the italicized words are an addition of the early Church, but do they not show that that Church connected 'remission' directly with the death of Christ? Again, in five of the six places in the Acts of the Apostles where 'remission of sins' is named, the preceding verses contain an account of the Death and Resurrection of our Lord. Is it not plain that 'remission' was thought of as the sequel and consequence of these—or rather, of this—for, as Dr. Taylor himself maintains, in the New Testament the Resurrection of Christ is never separated from His Death? Again, Dr. Taylor gives a careful exposition of most of Paul's text, 'In whom we have our redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses', but he omits to discuss the bearing of the words 'through his blood' at this point. Again, is it satisfactory to dismiss the references to 'remission' in Hebrews ix. 22 and x. 18 as 'general'? Are not the words 'Where remission (of sins) is, there is no more offering for sin' the conclusion of the main doctrinal part of the Epistle? Does not the phrase 'No more offering for sin' look back to the earlier words 'He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever' (Heb. x. 12), the two phrases together directly connecting 'remission of sin' with the Death of Christ?

The chapter on Justification might almost be described as triumphant. Dr. Taylor admits that he began the detailed examination of the term with the modern dislike of it, but he adds that as he proceeded with this study, this great doctrine gripped his mind. He gives us an exhaustive account, not only of the Greek verb rendered 'justify', but also of all the words whose root is the word for 'righteous', and concludes that the term 'justify' cannot mean 'to make righteous', but must mean 'to treat as righteous'. In the face of modern deprecations of Luther, it is refreshing to find Dr. Taylor doing him justice here. Dean Church once wrote that he supposed that no one would ever again maintain that the doctrine of Justification by Faith is *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*, but this is just what Dr. Taylor roundly declares. At the same time, he will not admit, with Sanday and Headlam, for instance, that there is something 'fictitious' in Justification, for he shows that Justification by *Faith* requires that in the believer there is already a God-given, even if incipient, righteousness. He shows too that in other parts of the New Testament there is something analogous to the 'Pauline' doctrine of Justification and he thinks that, while the preachers of to-day may wisely omit to use the Pauline term, they ought to preach the truth that the term connotes. In a book of fine chapters, there is none finer than this one.

The next chapter is on Reconciliation. Here Dr. Taylor shows that with Paul the dominant use of the word refers it to an act of God at the beginning of the experience of salvation. In modern use, on the other hand, it is often the favourite word for the whole experience. There is, however, as our author shows, a passage or two in Paul where the word refers to the perfected reconciliation, not only of man but of the universe, with God, that comes at the end of Christ's enterprise of salvation. Dr. Taylor suggests that here there is a gap in the theology of the Apostle. Among other discussions in this chapter, those on 'Peace with God' and 'Reconciliation and Sonship' are of special value. Perhaps more attention might have been given in the latter to the question 'Can the Pauline doctrine of Adoption be harmonized with the teaching of Jesus?' Under the section on 'Modern Theology' our author rightly dares to question the adequacy of Oman's account of Reconciliation in his *Grace and Personality*. He quotes, apparently with approval, Denney's statement that 'What an objective atonement means is that but for Christ and His Passion God would not be to us what He is', but at a later stage he adds, in effect, that if God were not to us what He is, there would have been no Christ and no Passion. It is not in what He is that the Atonement 'makes a difference' to God, but in what He is able to do for us.

The chapter on Fellowship (or 'communion') is very wide in scope, as it surely

ought to be. It includes careful expositions of the term itself, of Pauline 'mysticism', of the Johannine teaching of 'abiding' and 'being in Christ', of New Testament teaching on 'seeing' and 'knowing' God, of 'Fellowship in the Christian Community', of the origins of the whole doctrine of Fellowship, and of its place in modern theology. Having said earlier that 'Fellowship with God is a desperate challenge to thought and belief', Dr. Taylor now adds: 'All thought of communion with God which ignores the Cross of Christ is theological lightmindedness'. Those who disagree here can only be referred to Dr. Taylor's thorough examination of the subject. A question may be asked about his account of 'dying with Christ'. He rightly says that for the Christian there is, in a true sense, 'a Gethsemane and a Golgotha', but this is, or may be, a present and even a continuous experience. Do not some of the passages that he quotes from Paul use the *past* tense to describe something that *does not recur*? It may or may not be an accident that the Apostle never says that we 'died with Christ' in baptism, but in Romans vi. 4-8 is not the tense of 'died' to be put with the tense of 'buried with Him in baptism' and of 'crucified with Him'? Is not the key phrase 'baptized into His death', and is there not here a largely unexplored part of the Pauline doctrine of the believer's 'identification' with Christ?

In the chapter on Sanctification the discussion of New Testament terminology is not as full as in some other chapters, perhaps because there is little difference of opinion about its meaning. Here Dr. Taylor points out the scarcity of New Testament passages that directly connect the gift of the Holy Spirit with the Death of Christ. There is, however, much indirect evidence, and it is greatly to be hoped that Dr. Taylor will continue his studies in New Testament theology by enlarging his article in *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* and giving us a volume on the New Testament teaching on the subject. One of the topics that he discusses under Sanctification is Sinless Perfection and its possibility in this life. Here his conclusion under the relevant Pauline passages is that the Apostle had not 'reached a hard and fast conclusion'. Under the passages from the First Epistle of John he draws attention to such complementary texts as 'If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves', but concludes that 'so long as we rely steadily upon the grace of God, the possibility of sinless perfection cannot be denied'. His phrase, 'There is no support in New Testament teaching for the view that sanctification is a sudden and miraculous gift of the Spirit in response to importunate prayer' has a severe ring about it, but is it not true? Dr. Taylor deplores the lack of the development of the doctrine of Sanctification both in Luther and in much modern theology. He adds, however, that there are exceptions to this omission, and devotes a section largely to the Bishop of Oxford's volume on *The Vision of God*. On Scriptural grounds, as well as others, he prefers the phrase 'perfect love' to all alternatives, and quotes with telling effect from Charles Wesley's hymns and John Wesley's translations. Here, as well as elsewhere in the book, a Christian reader may readily discover that there may be a devotional use of theology.

The last chapter is headed 'Atonement' and is largely, though not wholly, a recapitulation. Beginning with a summary of his findings on the subject of the Atonement in his two earlier volumes, the author goes on to discuss its relationship to each of the subjects examined in this one, and ends with a summary of results. Dr. Taylor uses the word 'representative' for his own doctrine, but the terms 'corporate', 'mediatorial' and 'identification' also occur. To some it will seem that the last term is the best, and it may be that we shall need to coin an adjective 'identificatory' for the group of theories to which Dr. Taylor's belongs. As he says, there is a double identification, for Christ identified Himself with man and the believer identifies himself with Christ. It is necessary to emphasize the truth that Christ's self-identification with man covers the Passion as well as the Incarnation. Some will think that here there is no need to say with Dr. Taylor that the text 'Him who knew no sin (God)

made to be sin on our behalf' is hyperbolical. Similarly, unlike our author, some will think that the Writer to the Hebrews goes a great way (in his second chapter) towards 'telling us how the self-offering of Christ is effective'. Dr. Taylor, following Moberly, accepts a carefully defined doctrine of 'vicarious repentance', and, believing that on the Cross, Christ 'submitted to the judgement that overtakes human sin', is prepared to admit with Denney that there is a 'penal' element in Christ's sufferings. Is it not true, however, that 'repentance' and 'penalty' can only be used in this way under unusual definitions?

Unlike some other writers Dr. Taylor tells his readers clearly what he means when he uses the word 'sacrificial' of the Death of Christ. In his last chapter, for instance, he says that 'Christ's ministry is sacrificial, not as a sin- or a guilt-offering, but because He poured out His life in willing surrender for man, in order that they may freely consent to all that He does for them, and thus make Him the means of their penitent and believing approach to God'. All the ideas contained in such a sentence are indeed intrinsic to the doctrine of the Atonement, and, as Dr. Taylor says, their finest Old Testament expression is in the Songs of the Servant. But it may be doubted whether he is right in holding that these ideas were present, in however imperfect a form, in the *whole* sacrificial ritual of the Jews. Again, since the term for 'guilt-offering' is the one undoubtedly ritual reference in the greatest Isaianic passage, and since the Writer to the Hebrews compares Christ both to the High Priest and the sacrifice *on the Day of Atonement*, which was the day of the sin-offering *par excellence*, is it not extreme to say that Christ's sacrifice is not like that of a 'sin- or a guilt-offering'? To discuss this, however, would belong rather to a review of Dr. Taylor's earlier volumes than of this one. His exposure in its final chapter of the shortcomings of some other theories of the Atonement, his vindication of the organic connection between the Atonement and the 'Christian experience' in all its various aspects, and the almost passionate exposition of the 'good news', with which his book closes, are all of very great value.

There seem to be preachers who buy books that provide them with sermons 'ready-made'. They will not find any spoil in this book. But there are many other who long to preach about the Atonement, but hardly know how to do so because of what some would call the 'bankruptcy' of the 'classical' theories. In Dr. Taylor's three volumes such preachers will find 'good seed' to sow in the soil of their own minds, and there will be harvest for their hearers. This book shows, as no other book on the subject does, that there is a gospel for 'the present age'.

C. RYDER SMITH

Conditions of Peace. By E. H. Carr, Professor of International Politics in the University College of Wales. (Macmillan, 1942. 12s. 6d.)

'Conditions of Peace.' What is the use of discussing these when peace seems further off than ever? Surely the one thing to be done is to get on with the war, instead of misdirecting our attention to situations which may never arise. Yet, obscure as the future is, we shall eventually find ourselves in one of three positions: conquest by the enemy, a stalemate of mutual exhaustion, or (the only possibility that we can seriously contemplate) the triumph of the Allies. If we were faced by the first, any plans of ours as to peace conditions would be worth as little as a dream when one awakes. If we reach the third, to leave our minds a blank till the actual moment arrives is to prepare for another Versailles. If we were fated to the second, we should have to find some way of rebuilding the ruins.

But, as Professor Carr's title should remind us, it is conditions of peace that we

have to think about; not terms of victory. When the moment for the 'cease fire' arrives, however, the world will not be able to wait for a comprehensive settlement of all its problems. It will be necessary, without delaying a week, to provide for the feeding of millions of starving people; for restoring those foundations of order whose destruction German tyranny has begun and the loosened rage of their victims may threaten to complete; and for the reorganization of some kind of economic stability and activity, national and international. But this will be no mere restoration or reorganization. Professor Carr remarks on the dangerous ease with which these and other compounds of 're-' rise to the lips. Whether we escape from chaos or not, we shall find ourselves in a new world; but we may hope that if we can meet our immediate tasks, by international commissions which think more of economics than politics, and human needs than national frontiers, we may begin to see the path along which the remoter goal may be reached, when these same human needs can be so adequately and hopefully met that war will no longer seem worth while, even to a Prussian.

Some two years ago, in his *Twenty Years' Crisis*, Professor Carr rang the changes in the well-worn antithesis between idealism and realism. The League of Nations stood for idealism, and futile dreams of good-will and co-operation. Success depends on realism; the conviction that force is the only thing in this world that counts or can be counted on. Readers of the later book will observe a change of tone. Power is still put before us as supreme (almost a tautology, is it not?); but power must march with will and the recognition of duty. That is to say, as the League was built up on the conviction that the quarrels of each must be the concern of all—and none of the conspiracies against the principles of the League have been able to shake that axiom—so, political power must recognize that the happiness or contentment of each is impossible without the happiness or contentment of all. Otherwise it becomes a tyranny; and in the end every tyranny destroys itself.

This moralized view of 'power politics' is the real theme of the book; the first part of which deals with the general principles of political stability; the second, with the specific problems that rise from the relations of Great Britain, in the present and the future, with the European countries, the United States, Germany, and so on. Professor Carr is not one of those who are content to accept Hitler's estimate of the Versailles 'diktat'. But he is acutely conscious of its mistakes, however well intentioned their authors; above all, the mistake of attempting a political rather than an economic solution. The mistake was inevitable then. It was bound up with our conception of democracy and of nationalism. To both we were committed. The new Versailles will not be concerned, however, to build frontier walls, but to drive trade routes. It will preserve the fundamental truth of the old economics, that prosperity follows from the greatest possible interchange of goods; while correcting its fundamental error, that the interests of the producer must take precedence of those of the consumer.

Professor Carr's contentions will not all be accepted; for example, that Britain must always interest herself in continental questions; that a homogeneous Germany must be preserved; that London must give up the hope of remaining the financial centre of the world. Other subjects he passes over very lightly; the functions of nationality in the world community of the future; the reparations due from Germany to the peoples it has enslaved and outraged; the possibility of an international army of security. Federation he does not believe in. But no recent work either on short term or long term planning deserves more careful study; and no one will find it wholly a comfortable thing to disagree with its author.

W. F. LOFTHOUSE

The Historic Mission of Jesus. By C. J. Cadoux. (Lutterworth Press. 21s.)

Since Schweitzer's *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* the questions have been hotly debated, How far was the mind of Jesus limited by the apocalyptic beliefs current in His time? and How is the religious value of His teaching affected thereby? To answer these questions Dr. C. J. Cadoux has written an important book, which he has called *The Historic Mission of Jesus*. Part I considers the teaching of Jesus about Himself as the Bringer of the Kingdom. Jesus believed Himself to be the Son of God in a unique sense, a belief that was more fundamental than the consciousness of Messiahship which resulted from it. The apocalyptic aspects of the Messianic idea were subordinate to His thought of Himself as Servant of God and Bringer of God's Kingdom. Being Son of God in a unique sense, and charged with this commission, Jesus claimed an authority greater than any other had claimed. He may have been Son of David, but He laid no stress on it. He called Himself Son of Man, a phrase which stands primarily for the saved and saving Remnant of Israel, with Himself as its head. In Part II Dr. Cadoux treats of the Kingdom of God, which means in the first place men's submission of themselves to God as King. But the term has further meanings, personal and filial, as well as social and eschatological. The kingdom is already present in Jesus and those who follow Him. Jesus thought and spoke of the kingdom as if it were mainly at least the concern of the Jews, but He clearly recognized that the Gentiles had a place in it. The universalistic note in His teaching is not emphasized unduly, lest it should thereby unnecessarily arouse His countrymen's antipathy. Many have asserted that Jesus excluded politics from His thought; Dr. Cadoux maintains that His teaching on loving one's enemies, etc., was designed to teach the Jews not to seek vengeance on Rome, not to pursue a policy of hate but of reconciliation, and so to become the spiritual and moral guide to the Gentiles. Parts III and IV deal with the future of the kingdom. Dr. Cadoux maintains that Jesus did not anticipate at the first His rejection. He hoped to succeed in persuading the Jews to accept Him as Messiah. As Jewish thought pictured the full realization of the kingdom in the future, so Jesus looked forward to a catastrophic coming of the kingdom, within the lifetime of His own generation. This would result not only from the providence of God but also from the co-operative service of men. Jesus was disappointed at His rejection by the Jews, but saw that unless He fled or fought, His rejection would bring about His death. He voluntarily accepted His death as coming in the practical fulfilment of His ministry; but He believed His death would be the means of moving men to penitence for their sin. (Is this, it may be asked, an adequate statement of Jesus' conception of the significance of His death?) He foresaw that the Jews' rejection of Him and of His policy of reconciliation with Rome would lead to their revolt against and destruction by Rome. Jesus prophesied His return to earth as Son of Man, that is, in company with the redeemed community. In the interval (it might be as long as thirty years or more) He thought of His disciples preaching the good news of the kingdom. He established a community of those who believed on Him, and in that sense founded a Church; though we cannot be sure that He enjoined Baptism or the repetition of the Lord's Supper. He expected the Roman conquest and destruction of Jerusalem to occur in the near future, and His own return to follow it some years later. This return would inaugurate the great 'Coming' of the kingdom and the meting out of punishments and rewards to each.

In calling his book *The Historic Mission of Jesus* Dr. Cadoux challenges the view of those who claim that it is impossible to get behind the Gospels to a real 'Historic Jesus' distinguishable from the Christ of faith. He frankly admits that in his view the eschatological teaching of Jesus contains an element of human ignorance and error; but he claims that 'His life is of so divine a quality, that the more we learn by the aid of bold critical scrutiny, the more we are conscious of owing Him a debt as our

Saviour in the full experiential sense of the word, despite the somewhat alarming discovery of previously-unrealized limitations, whereby His ministry to men was conditioned'. Dr. Cadoux's knowledge of the vast literature, his critical acumen, his lucid statement of his own conclusions make his book a notable contribution to a difficult subject. It will be seen from what has already been written that, while rejecting Schweitzer's interpretation, Dr. Cadoux by no means accepts the 'realized eschatology' of Otto and C. H. Dodd. All serious students of the New Testament, those who do not as well as those who do agree with the author's pacifist interpretation of the mission of Jesus, will be grateful for this stimulating book, with its carefully reasoned conclusions and its many interesting footnotes.

F. B. CLOOG

The Book of Isaiah. By Rev. E. J. Kissane, D.D., L.S.S. Vol. I (chaps. i-xxxix). (Brown & Nolan, Dublin. 21s.)

A commentary on the Book of Isaiah that takes account of recent scholarship has long been overdue. This is the first volume of such a commentary, written by a Roman Catholic scholar. It bears the *imprimatur* of the Archbishop of Dublin. This is noteworthy, because Dr. Kissane uses the methods of the Higher Criticism and hitherto the Roman Catholic authorities have been slow to admit their use. But Dr. Kissane uses the *methods* of the 'Higher Critics' to challenge their *results*. In the present volume he deals with the first part of the Book of Isaiah and he claims to show that the whole of it, apart from a few editorial changes and additions, was written by the Son of Amoz. He hardly gives any hint of the way in which he will deal with chapters xl-lxvi, but his volume on those chapters will be awaited with interest.

There is, of course, nothing in the methods of the Higher Criticism that requires that it should be used only to establish 'radical' results. No one can object to their being used to establish 'conservative' conclusions merely because these are 'conservative'. In this volume we find the author taking the familiar way of the Higher Critic—for instance, correction of the Hebrew text (as when he claims that in some passages a later scribe has substituted the word 'Babylon' for the word 'Assyria'), the admission of the intrusion of editorial notes in prose, the claim that at some points there are dis-arrangements of the text, and so on. It cannot be said that Dr. Kissane uses such devices more than the 'radical' school uses them, or that many of his suggestions are not at least as reasonable as theirs. No doubt his suggestions will in due time be each considered on its own merits. The general reader can only wait till this is done.

Special mention, however, may be made of two subjects on which Dr. Kissane challenges his predecessors in the Higher Criticism. While there is general agreement that the typical Prophet was a poet, there is much discussion both about Hebrew metre in general and about the particular problem of the extent to which deviations from metrical rule were allowed. To use a modern parallel, did Hebrew poets follow the rules of Hebrew metre with the exactness with which Victorian poets followed those of English metre, or did they allow themselves the manifold liberties with metre that English poets delight to use to-day? Dr. Kissane claims that almost the whole of Isaiah's own prophecies are in regular Hebrew metres, and he supports the claim by giving us a complete translation of the oracles that follows the Hebrew poetry line by line. It is here, perhaps, that he makes his chief contribution to the study of the book, even if it should only be by way of provoking 'the other side' to a sustained reply.

This leads to the second outstanding point in this author's challenge. Some students of the Prophets seem recently to have almost committed themselves to the postulate that every prophetic passage must be broken up into quite brief 'oracles'

because extreme brevity was characteristic of 'oracles'. Dr. Kissane will have nothing to do with this 'fragment-theory'. He claims to divide Isaiah's prophecies into a number of poems of considerable length, each poem consisting of a series of stanzas in a regular metre and with the same number of lines, and each stanza developing the thought of its predecessor. Under the last point the general reader will probably think that the author meets with varying success, but there can be no doubt that on this whole subject too Dr. Kissane makes out a case for examination.

The book begins with an excellent 'Introduction' of more than sixty pages, in which the author discusses all the relevant subjects. At one point, though only at one, this discussion is inadequate. This is under the subject 'The Messiah and His Kingdom'. Here we look in vain for a clear answer to the question, 'Did the Prophet expect his anticipations of the triumph of the coming King to be fulfilled soon?' Something is indeed partly said and partly implied in the commentary on the crucial passage, vii. i-viii. 8. Here the author does not draw together very clearly the results of his elaborate discussion of detail, but he seems to maintain that Isaiah left open the whole question of the date of the fulfilment of his hopes, but that the prophecy is to be interpreted in part of the days of Ahaz and in part of the days of Jesus. Again, Dr. Kissane admits that the Hebrew word rendered 'virgin' need not mean an 'unmarried woman', but claims that, as time went on, Israel came to see that a 'virgin' was meant. It is hard to avoid the conclusion that here an artificial exegesis has been adopted because of the quotation from the passage in the first Gospel.

The 'general reader' has been named more than once because this commentary has been specifically written for him. In spite of the caveats entered above, he need have no fear that his understanding of the great mass of the book will be balked by the technicalities of the expert. While Dr. Kissane includes an irreducible number of notes on the Hebrew text, he keeps these quite separate. For the rest, under each poem he discusses first such topics as its date, unity and contents; next comes the translation already named, which is of very great merit; finally there follows a very detailed exposition of a kind that the 'way-faring man', who wants to understand the Book of Isaiah, will welcome. This is a very thorough book indeed.

C. RYDER SMITH

Methodism has a Message! By Bishop Paul B. Kern. (Abingdon Press. \$1.75).

The urge of this book by Bishop Paul B. Kern of the Methodist Church of America (meant for that, 'the largest Protestant denomination in America' primarily) will help Methodism in the Homeland—if it is read, marked and inwardly digested here. No one knowing the facts would say that all is well with the organized Church of Christ to-day. But those who criticize her from the outside, show they do not know what really spiritual blessing is coming to the world through her manifold and often sacrificial service, in spite of inadequate supply of workers and money. This Britain is spending £12 millions a day on the war, and only £1½ millions a year is sent out to lands across the sea for the propagation of the Gospel. British Methodism's share only gives in a year what the Chancellor of the Exchequer is spending in thirty minutes' war. The Methodist Home Mission Fund is just now £21,000 in debt. At home and abroad there are clamant calls for more volunteers—men and women, and for munitions; if Satan's strongholds are to be overthrown and souls of men and women are to be won for Christ. This is 'the central business of the Church', rightly says Bishop Kern, who says 'Methodism has a really true message concerning the Church', which is as 'eternal as the will of God' for she proclaims its 'Holiness, Catholicity, Unity and Apostolicity, which are the marks *ab origine* of the Church of the Living God'. John Wesley said, 'The world is my parish!' Bishop Kern proves himself a true follower

of our Founder in stressing the universal character of Methodism and also the fact that 'Methodists accept the doctrinal basis of the historic creeds of Christendom'. We wish that the younger generation of our people, who have had more scholastic opportunities than their parents had, and 'sniff' at the lay preacher whose education has been that gained more from his hard struggles to earn a living than from books—though he willingly spends all he can in buying books to help him in preparation for his Sunday school teaching or his preaching appointments. He may, whilst away at an expensive public school or university—this 'son' of privilege—have sat under preachers who had 'drifted into an unhuman intellectualism' and himself become a dupe of what the Bishop rightly calls 'the soft secularism which so easily besets our spiritual life' in this modern day. He condemns the appeal to emotion by the preacher with 'a flaming message' and fails to realize that 'it is from lips that have been touched with a coal of fire' after study, guided by the Holy Spirit, of the best authorities. Methodist preachers to-day should adapt themselves to different types, following in the steps of Paul, who was copied by Wesley being 'equally at home in St. Mary's, Oxford, pulpit; in the open air speaking to Bristol miners or the rough peasants of Wales'.

If Wesley's 'Twelve Rules of a Helper' had been kept and the Class Leaders had been preponderatingly lay instead of so many ministerial ones, as Wesley appointed Leaders of Classes, there might have been less truth in this writer's criticism of the machinery of Methodism as 'unwieldly, overintricate and cumbersome'. 'Are we in danger of squandering our power in an effort to make the wheels go round?' he asks and avers that this question must be seriously faced. 'The Early Church got its start through personal testimony', and Wesley's *Journal*, May 20, 1740, shows 'that the man who changed England' was unwilling to let a casual companion go until he 'had shown him his heart'. To-day Methodists should evince the same passion for souls, personal holiness and the sanctification of the believer; emphasize our Arminianism. We think Dr. Hern could stress the power exerted by the song ministry of Charles Wesley's hymns. Prayerful perusal of this forceful book will help many to sing more fervently:

'O let me commend my Saviour to you,
I set to my seal that Jesus is true:
Ye all may find favour who come at His call;
O come to my Saviour! His grace is for all.'

GEORGE A. SWAINE

Prayer. By George A. Buttrick. (Abingdon Cokesbury Press, New York. \$2.75.)

This large book steps out of the box in which it is packed in handsome format, beautifully printed on pure white paper, to make publishers this side envious of a production at such a low price. As a treatise on Prayer, it is quite unlike anything to which we are accustomed over here. The style of writing is a little rhetorical and illustrations and literary quotations are multiplied. For readers accustomed to books less restrained and more colourful than our own, this will be an advantage and not considered as a blemish. It may be hinted, however, that the work would lose nothing if its author had been content to assimilate the contents of books studied and set down the results in his own words. The lists of references and books at the end are a constant temptation to refer back and thus distract attention from the argument. *Prayer* deals with the problem of prayer as it arises for the average practical man interested in ultimate things. It is a strictly Protestant approach and says nothing about the higher reaches of the devotional life—the Prayer of Quiet or Contemplation upon which so much stress was laid up to the Reformation period.

fact that
m'. We
scholastic
education
books—
tion for
away at
t under
come a
sets our
teacher
ouched
orities,
ving in
Mary's,
ants of

rs had
Vesley
ticism
'Are
und?'
ch got
'that
til he
on for
nian-
arles
more

NE

75.)
nat,
of a
ing
and
to
and
ose
ied
the
cal
ays
or
d.

Among Free Churchmen here there is an attempt to combine the best in Catholic and Protestant aspirations. Mr. Buttrick's purpose, among others, is to 'lead prayer out of the killing shadow of the false totalitarianism of the scientific theory of the world'. He tackles with ability the difficulty raised for petitionary prayer by a so-called fixed law. He argues with convincing logic that 'Nature's changing face and our experience combine to teach us that God works in a paradox of unpredictable newness and trustworthy faithfulness. The spontaneity is as marked an aspect as the fixity'. The work is divided into four parts: Jesus and Prayer; Prayer and the World; Prayer and Personality; A Way of Prayer. In Part Three the author comes to grips with psychology and goes a long way to justifying a claim to a fresh approach to aspects of prayer. Instinct and motive are carefully examined and we are shown how prayer gives knowledge of the meaning of motives, cleanses and sublimates them, gathers and unifies, and also how prayer releases power. Mr. Buttrick quotes what Moody once wrote in a man's Bible: 'This book will keep you from your sins, or your sins will keep you from this book'. A sample of the many happy illustrations as well as the multitude of good things in this book.

J. H. BODGENER

The Athenaeum: A Mirror of Victorian Culture. By Leslie A. Marchand. (Chapel Hill. The University of North Carolina Press. \$3.50.)

This engaging book portrays the career of a famous journal. Launched in 1828, the *Athenaeum* aimed to exercise an influence not unlike the *Athenaeum* of antiquity. Two 'Cambridge Apostles', Frederick Denison Maurice and John Sterling, served brief terms as editors during an uncertain period. But the new venture was soon established under the editorship of Charles Wentworth Dilke (1830-46).

A man of keen intelligence and fearless independence Dilke exercised a Spartan control. His catholicity of interests is attributed to his passionate love of truth. He had a wide knowledge of books and was acclaimed an eighteenth-century scholar second to none. Nor were his enthusiasms limited to scholarship. A sturdy Radical, he pinned his faith in progress through the advancement of knowledge. He had an eye for men 'forward-looking' as well as eminent in scientific research; and the *Athenaeum* reflected the advance in literature, science and art not merely in England but throughout the world.

Dilke boldly attacked the prevalent system of 'Puffery' which tainted even the leading periodicals. His fearlessness attracted a staff of 'competent critics and correspondents', whose integrity ably seconded the unwavering efforts of their chief; and his aim: to make literature, science and art popular without stooping to 'popularize', reflects the specific influence wielded by the *Athenaeum* under his regime. His successors: T. K. Hervey (1846-53) and Hepworth Dixon (1846-69) failed to command the respect accorded to Dilke: readers missed the direct impress of his vigorous personality and members of the staff and friends of authors loomed too large in the reviews; and the *Athenaeum's* authority as 'a safe and impartial guide' declined.

A new era began when Dilke's grandson, Charles Wentworth Dilke 3rd, assumed control in 1869. Between the two there had long been a marked kinship of thought and interest; and to carry forward the work was in itself a trust beyond the mere concerns of business. A keen Liberal and a disciple of Mill, young Dilke was considered by Disraeli to be the 'most influential and powerful' among younger members of Parliament he had ever known. With Norman MacColl in the editor's chair, Dilke maintained a personal interest until absorbed in politics. Theodore Watts-Dunton joined the staff and contributors included Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Edmund Gosse, Andrew Lang, W. E. Henley and Richard Garnett. The *Athenaeum* had now recovered

its lost prestige as a critical weekly and forged ahead beyond all competitors. Mr. Marchand continues the story of its varying fortunes to its last years as an independent journal under the editorship of Arthur Greenwood (1916-20) and J. Middleton Murry (1920-21) when it was merged with the *Nation* as the *Nation and Athenaeum*.

The 'Inner Circle' under Dilke offers many interesting sidelights: John Hamilton Reynolds held there must be more life got into the Academy: we must rattle its old bones about. Henry Fothergill Chorley, proud to have been one of the few to discern 'the print of a man's foot in the sand' when Browning's *Pauline* was reviewed, may stand as a warning in echoing the popular criticism of Turner: 'Splendour of colour, once Turner's chief excellence, is the rock upon which his fame will be wrecked'. It was to Chorley that a correspondent began his letter: 'You worm!' Lady Morgan, whose style preserved the freshness of the morning, had 'an audacity that flew at the highest game'. George Darley's vigorous style is illustrated in his note on Johnson: 'He spoke earthquake, and spat central fire'. John Abraham Heraud, poet and dramatist, 'a worshipper of the vast, the remote, the terrible', yet Carlyle thought him 'the cheerfulest best-natured little creature extant'.

Critics and departmental specialists light up the early Victorian scene. Here Mr. Marchand challenges the loose generalizations of Professor Lounsbury, whose chief impression of the literary criticism of the period is of its 'general worthlessness'. Mr. Marchand's view is 'neither an unqualified defence nor an indictment of its shortcomings and blindness'. His account is rather a 'key' to its beliefs and attitudes. Under the influence of Wordsworth, Coleridge, Hazlitt, Lamb, De Quincey and Leigh Hunt romantic criticism had gained ascendancy in 1830. Even Macaulay defended the romantic poets against the false doctrine of 'correctness' as interpreted in the age of Pope. The earlier romantic group found their chief good in 'individual intensity of feeling', whereas Victorian Romanticism sought to apply its intuitional knowledge 'to social rather than to individual uses'. And Mr. Marchand makes vivid the new romantic attitude, showing that man must no longer 'bathe selfishly' in the well of truth; that he must 'use the waters for the general healing'. It was this 'spiritual-social' value of literature that had such a marked effect on periodical criticism. And ample evidence is adduced to show that the attitude of the *Athenaeum* circle was generally 'on the side of romanticism tempered by reason and guided by the intellect'. Fellowship of the human spirit was their great concern.

A review by Elizabeth Barrett illustrates how often Wordsworth furnished the standard of critical estimate: 'Poor Byron discovered not a heart, but the wound of a heart; not humanity, but disease; not life, but a crisis! Byron was a poet through pain. Wordsworth is a feeling man, because he is a thoughtful man. Wordsworth's eye is his soul.' Maurice, who passed the conventional moral judgement, yet defended Byron's right to a place in Westminster Abbey; and there were occasional tributes to Byron as a champion of liberty and the people's rights. Cunningham's estimate of Scott as 'a poet truly national and heroic' re-echoed popular sentiment and in his appeal to the general public Byron was praised along with Scott. Yet it is noted that critics who pounced upon Bryon let Scott escape. One cannot but recall Scott's own comment: 'He hits the mark when I don't even fledge my arrow.'

The attitude of the *Athenaeum* to the poets of the 'Cockney School' presents a striking contrast to the ruthless attacks of the *Quarterly* and *Blackwood's*. The *Athenaeum* indeed was among the first to champion both Shelley and Keats. Dilke admired them both: 'Shelley was a worshipper of truth—Keats of beauty; Shelley had the greater power—Keats the finer imagination: both were single-hearted, sincere, admirable men and had the same hopes of the moral improvement of society.'

Interest deepens as the major figures of the Victorian period come under review. Tennyson, Browning, Dickens, Carlyle, Thackeray and Ruskin furnished alluring

targets for critical arrows. Mill alone escaped. Here again *Athenaeum* criticism attained a high standard, always aiming to deliver judgements unbiassed by party or by creed. And later evaluations not infrequently confirm its insight and its verdicts.

Dilke's fight against criticism with an axe to grind is stimulating reading and one of the high-lights of the *Athenaeum's* record. It exposed publishers, authors and contemporary journals and witnessed the triumph of complete independence. Throughout Dilke set a rare example of moral and intellectual integrity and never allowed the money, or any other interest, to choke the free expression of thought. Here, at least, the *Athenaeum* emphasized the ethical responsibility of editors and few but will endorse Mr. Marchand's verdict: it was in keeping a balanced keel in literary waters that the *Athenaeum* excelled.

B. AQUILA BARBER

Periodical Literature

BRITISH

Hibbert Journal. (Vol. xl, No. 2.)

This number is well-mixed fare providing the usual excellent reading. It opens with a stimulating discussion by Maude D. M. Petre, on 'What Russia Can Teach Us', in which she argues that State tyranny of Fascism, Nazism, Bolshevism has been accepted by large numbers mainly as a short cut to much needed reforms. But at the same time declaring that short cuts are dangerous. And pleading for the avoidance of the short cut; since men will sacrifice liberty for well-being, we ought to find a way of securing well-being without the dangerous renunciation of liberty. The writer is a Roman Catholic, which consideration makes her plea for understanding between our two countries the more arresting. Hamilton Fyfe has a striking article on 'Matthew Arnold and the Fall of France', in which he recalls a prophecy which has come lamentably true. More than fifty years ago Matthew Arnold foretold the downfall of France. He saw that France was suffering from a dangerous and perhaps fatal disease which would destroy her powers of soul and spirit. In only one respect has Arnold been proved wrong, he argued that it was the moral failure of unsound majorities which destroyed states. He blamed the mass of the French people, he should have rather blamed a small minority. The article is also intended to be a serious warning to our own country in the moral outlook of to-day. Remember France is a call to us. 'The Triumph of Pessimism', by Dr. Alfred Cobban, and 'A New and Better World', by Ray Knight, deal trenchantly with the present world condition. 'Humanism—Bankrupt and Otherwise', by Dr. L. A. Reid, provides good reading, in which he declares Christianity to be release, yet not escapism, but the first introduction to the Real. There is the usual 'Survey of Recent Philosophical Literature', by Dr. S. H. Mellone, and Reviews.

The Congregational Quarterly (January, 1942).—This number contains two stimulating articles, 'Re-energizing Religion' by the late Frank Peck, and 'Missionary Apologia To-day' by Rev. H. G. Newsham. The former deals with the interpretation of essentially religious ideas and shows that every ennobling, ascending idea demands its sacrifice, whether in science, politics, economics, philosophy or morals. The latter, which raises the question, 'Is the modern Missionary Movement going Nazi?' is concerned with the character of the claims of Christ and the manner of their presentation by the entire Church. In 'Some Reflections of a Back Number', Dr. W. B. Selbie, foreseeing the moral and spiritual chaos awaiting the post-war world,

considers the question of the moment is whether the Christian Church can rise to the height of its opportunity as the agent of the Christian religion. There are articles on 'Americans, the Monroe Doctrine, and the Future' by Rev. Gwilym O. Griffith, 'A Study in Tone' by Rev. T. E. Morris, 'Two Poets Laureate' and 'The Idylls of the King' by William Saunders. There is also a charming missionary sketch, 'The Story of Jang Jin Ju,' reprinted from Miss Joy Homer's *Dawn Watch in China*.

Religion in Education (S.C.M. Press, January, 1942).—The scope of this issue is as wide as its title. The Editor reports approvingly the action of the Board of Education in adding to the courses of instruction in Religious Knowledge. The Bishop of Liverpool is anxious that nothing shall hinder the fulfilment of the demand for effective doctrinal teaching of children. S. R. Woods writes as a headmaster of a secondary school on the paramount importance of moral training in English secondary schools. Dr. E. L. Allen surveys forty years' work on the Gospels as done by outstanding expositors. Margaret Avery continues her valuable lesson notes on the New Testament. Professor T. H. Robinson pleads for the teaching of Bible History. Rev. Gerald Myles discusses the precarious position of Religious Education in Northern Ireland. The reviews of recent educational literature offer real guidance.

AMERICAN

The Moslem World (January, 1942).—The opening article is a review by Dr. R. C. Spier of the Editor's outstanding book, *The Cross above the Crescent*. A paper on the Bektashi dervishes gives an interesting account of this potent secret order in the shaping of Turkish destiny. 'The Kingdom of this World' by H. Dürr is a translated study of the growth and exclusiveness of Islam. In a poem written in 1329, and here translated, N. N. Martinovitch stresses the plea of a Muslim mystic for international unity. H. S. Santesson quotes the interesting work of the lesser Timuride and Afghan poets. Dr. N. A. Faris outlines Al Ghazali's Rules of Conduct. The great renunciation of this eleventh-century mystic is full of meaning. This fact the Editor emphasizes in his article, 'J. Rendel Harris on Al Ghazali'. C. I. Ullah recounts his conversion from Islam in a very human document. Signed book reviews and discussions complete a good issue.

The Yale Review (Winter, 1942).—This national quarterly has much of the vigour and breadth of the American mind. Thornton Wilder writes approvingly of the re-action to the blitz as revealed in a month's tour of England. Food supplies in the future and better conditions in the home are the concerns of Alvin Johnson in his article on the Post War Farmer. Julian Huxley writes of the New British Democracy, outlines the principles needed and encourages all that makes for it. Ralph Kent describes the German invasion of Greece with all the skill of an observant teacher. The truce between Science and Letters is portrayed by Herbert J. Muller, who points out that the chief value of science is as co-worker not a servant of literature. The change over from settled peace to total war in Canada is discussed by Maxwell Cohen and similarly Quincy Howe writes of American Foreign Policy and Public Opinion. Japan's dilemma, by Nathaniel Peffer, underrates that country as events have proved. The whole issue is worthy and international. The fiction, poetry and reviews reach the high standard expected of this virile quarterly.